THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1937. Vol. XXVII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The new President of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

The unanimous election of Dr. Cyril Norwood, President of St. John's College, Oxford, to be President of the Modern Churchmen's Union in succession to the Dean of St. Paul's, has given general satisfaction in Modernist Church circles.

Dr. Norwood, formerly Master of Marlborough College, and later Headmaster of Harrow School, in both of which spheres he achieved marked success, is one of our greatest educational authorities. He has assisted the deliberations and reforms of many educational bodies and is the author of several volumes on education, notably, *The English Educational System* and *The English Tradition in Education.* He has been a member of the M.C.U. for nearly a quarter of a century. As far back as 1915 Dr. Norwood contributed a paper to the Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen at Rugby on 'The Creeds and their Teaching.' The lesson which he then stressed—the need for dogmatic simplification in the interests of ecclesiastical unity—needs to

be learnt as much by the Church to-day as then. In the concluding paragraph of his paper he wrote :

> 'If we must each of us assert that our own definition as to the mode in which these things happened in the world is alone correct, and that we can have no communion save with those who think as we do, then is there an end to hope both 'for the work of the ministry and for the edifying of the body of Christ.' But if we are ready to accept each other's affirmations, and to recognize that the human spirit, as it grows, attains to greater heights and depths, and cannot be bound by its own formulae for all time, then there is real hope . . . '

Dr. Norwood also contributed a paper to the notable Conference held at Girton in 1921. In dealing with his theme, 'Is a Creed Necessary or Desirable?' Dr. Norwood said :

> 'Christian faith contains two elements, an intellectual assent, and a moral and spiritual affirmation : it covers the acceptance of certain events as historical facts, and the acceptance of certain views about those facts : and it covers also, on the other hand, an inner disposition and a living experience, a whole attitude which gives life its meaning and its value. The one part is the province of belief, the other of faith. And I hold that the one should be limited to the bare essentials, and alone forms the proper subject-matter of a creed : it is finite, the terminus *a quo* : but the other, the terminus *ad quem*, is infinite, changes with the changing experience of the generations, opens out a new horizon with every new age, and is never the proper subject of a creed. For the one purpose a creed seems to me to be necessary and desirable, but for the other certainly not desirable and certainly not necessary.'

As a lay President Dr. Norwood is in the succession of Sir Thomas Dyke-Acland and Professor Percy Gardner. We are sure that our cause will owe much to his able and judicious leadership. Dr. Norwood has always taken a very practical part in the life of the Church : on not a few occasions giving up part of his hard-earned vacations to the conducting of Sunday services in rural parishes. Our new President has just left England on an educational mission to New Zealand at the invitation of the Government of that Dominion.

Prayer and Parliament.

The Coronation having been safely concluded to the satisfaction of all loyal subjects of the Crown, and the Divine blessing duly invoked on our Sovereign that his reign may promote the welfare of his people and the advancement of the Kingdom of God among mankind, it is not inappropriate that the thoughts of the nation should now be religiously directed to

Parliament — the chief instrument of our Sovereign's government. A most opportune and interesting article on 'Parliament at Prayer' is contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* for April, by its editor, Sir Arnold Wilson. It will seem to some to be one of those ironic coincidences of history that

> 'The earliest recorded instance in the Church of England of special prayers on behalf of a new sovereign is that of Richard II, who in 1377 directed the bishops to enjoin upon the clergy the duty of public and private prayer for Divine guidance and protection for him.'

Richard II, although Shakespeare represents him as a convinced believer in the Divine Right of Kings,

> 'Not all the waters in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm from an anointed king:
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the Lord.'
>
> *Richard II*, Act II, Scene 3.

yet few of our sovereigns had a more disastrous reign or have concluded it under more miserable circumstances. A no less ironic historic coincidence is that Archbishop Laud composed in 1625 the noble petition for the High Court of Parliament inserted in our Prayer Book of 1662 for the guidance of that very Parliament (the Long Parliament) which later authorized Laud's execution. The obvious inference being that prayers that are in accordance with men's desires, but are not in accordance with the Divine Will, have no prospect of fulfilment. The English statesman who most clearly perceived this truth, or at least expressed it in no unfaltering terms, was Lord Palmerston. Sir Arnold Wilson aptly recalls the occasion:

> 'In the autumn of 1853 Lord Palmerston, then Home Secretary, received an address from the Presbytery of Edinburgh requesting the appointment of a day of national prayer and fasting, in view of the probable approach of cholera. To this his lordship replied:
>
> 'It does not appear to Lord Palmerston that a national fast would be suitable to the circumstances of the present moment. The Maker of the universe established certain laws of nature for the planet on which we live, and the weal or woe of mankind depends upon the observance or neglect of those laws. Lord Palmerston would suggest that the best course which the people of this country can pursue, to deserve that the further progress of the cholera should be stayed, will be to employ the interval that will elapse between the present time and the beginning of next spring in planning and executing measures, by which those portions of their towns and cities which are inhabited by the poorer classes, and which, from the nature of things, must

most need purification and improvement, may be freed from those causes and sources of contagion which, if allowed to remain, will infallibly breed pestilence and be fruitful in death, in spite of all the prayers and fastings of an united but inactive nation. When man has done his utmost for his own safety, then is the time to invoke the blessing of Heaven to give effect to his exertions.'

Some may feel that although from 'the earliest times of which we have any record Church and State in this country have existed as parallel and interdependent powers, and prayer has always preceded executive action and public deliberations, and in particular those of Parliament,' yet in view of the fact that a number of members of Parliament are to-day not professing Christians, this practice ought to be abandoned. This suggestion lacks cogency inasmuch as faith in God extends far beyond the bounds of the Christian religion, and prayer to God is infinitely older and wider than Christianity. The words of William Blake's hymn,

'Then every man, of every clime,
That prays in his distress,
Prays to the human form divine,
Love, Mercy, Pity, Peace.

And all must love the human form,
In heathen, Turk, or Jew:
Where Mercy, Love, and Pity dwell
There God is dwelling too.'

will suggest that inasmuch as all human beings are children of God and are recipients of the Divine Spirit, they may all, whatever their religious denominations be, dutifully and profitably unite in common prayer to the Divine Father of all for His guidance and blessing on their endeavours for the welfare of their own nation and of all mankind. What however is requisite, if these petitioners are to join whole-heartedly in such prayers, is that those prayers should be as simply, and profoundly phrased as possible so as to voice the common faith and the common need without directing attention to religious differences.

Can Religion unite Mankind?

One of the most divisive factors in human history has been religion. Each new religion has created a separatist and antagonistic society: so antagonistic in certain cases that war has resulted. It is therefore not unnatural to-day that in our efforts

to secure universal peace the influence of religion should come under consideration. If religion has divided mankind acutely: if religious intolerance be the most bitter kind of intolerance: if religious fanaticism be the most deadly kind of fanaticism, there are, on the other hand, forces in religion which can make for human unity as they can for human welfare. An effort is now being made to bring these forces to light and to utilize them in the interests of universal peace. These unifying religious forces are by no means so obvious as the divisive religious forces, and that is because they are more profound and, we believe, more enduring than their antagonists. Sir Francis Younghusband is a leader in this movement to utilize the religions of mankind to promote the peace of mankind. The second World Congress of Faiths, having this purpose in view, is to be held under his leadership at Oxford from July 23rd to 27th.

At this Congress all the chief religions of the world will be represented and expounded. United religious services will be held. The aim of the Congress is to secure mutual understanding in the sphere of religion, not critical comparison. We have had too much of the latter, the critical comparison always ending with the claim that the religion espoused by the critic is superior to all others. Of course, critical comparison must have its place if one religion is to become the religion of all humanity, but much understanding of the nature of religion, and much sympathy and reverence for the religion of others, must precede critical comparison. This will lead to critical comparison being conducted on positive rather than on negative lines. The final test of true religion and its propagandist power will be found in the end to be that which it creates in the human spirit and the manifestation of it in personal character and conduct, and in the type of civilization which it produces and promotes. What, in this age of universal publicity, is the value of missionary propagandist effort on behalf of a religion which has failed to promote the highest human welfare in the country from which the missionary comes? To-day religion has to shew effectively its beneficent power at home before it can hope to have any success abroad.

The specific theme of the coming Oxford Congress of Faiths is 'The World's Need of Religion.' Religion itself is a many-

sided term, and at least fifty definitions of it can be provided, but if in this connection religion is taken to mean 'sane relations with the Eternal,' and through them humane relations with one another, a sound basis will have been secured. No scientific student of religions can view them as all equal in this respect, but in so far as they possess truth and vitality they are capable of development. Whilst the religious union of humanity is desirable, we do well to remember that religious union on anything less than the highest level would be disastrous. Dean Inge wrote of the 1936 Congress of Faiths:

> 'I was afraid that the upshot would be that all religions are much the same, one as good as another, or that the object would be to find the lowest common denominator . . . I was mistaken.'

Such a Congress should inspire all the religions taking part in it to rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things. Christians who take a static view of the Christian religion are exhibiting a hostile attitude to this Congress because they are afraid of religious unity by levelling down. Christians who take a dynamic view of Christianity have no fears, for they look forward to unity by levelling up.

The Popularization of Modernism.

In ecclesiastical gatherings hearty applause has often been evoked by the speaker's declaration that Modernism may appeal to the high-browed but that it has no message of value for ordinary people, the speaker concluding his statement by affirming that he has never yet met a modernist maidservant. A closer acquaintance with the labouring classes would indicate that they are at least as sympathetic to Modernism as the rank and file of their employers. What however is needed are popular, positive, practical expositions of Christian Modernism. Such an exposition has just been provided by Mr. Watcyn-Williams, a Presbyterian minister working in the Welsh distressed areas. Many try to write popular expositions of the Christian religion but fail miserably in the attempt. Mr. Watcyn-Williams, in his volume *Where the Shoe Pinches*,* would seem to have succeeded. Over

* *Where the Shoe Pinches*, by Morgan Watcyn-Williams. (S.C.M. 2/-. 1937.)

a thousand copies have been sold since its publication: some three hundred of them are in circulation in unemployed camps in Wales. The author thus describes the purpose of his book:

> 'Our purpose has been to provide a sort of handbook for the thoughtful wayfaring man, a rough and ready map, with the aid of which he can find his way about. It may prove of some slight service to those who would commend Christianity to others' (p. 127).

The four following passages culled from this volume will indicate its outlook and quality:

> 'What is called "Modernism" is a tendency or point of view, rather than a set of beliefs. It came into being largely as the result of the critical spirit which also gave birth to science. It holds that all our beliefs should be submitted to the examination of reason and conscience.'

> 'What people want,' wrote the late Dr. McTaggart, 'is a religion they can believe to be true.'

> 'We believe that religion and science are not enemies, but allies. We agree with Dean Inge that superstition is the foe of both. Their apparent opposition is due to extravagant and exclusive claims made for them by their supporters, not to something inherent in their nature.'

> 'In our physical and social environment Jesus saw the raw material of the Kingdom of God . . . The material was not here, the social there, and God somewhere else. In and through material things, and in and through the people who handled them, God revealed a purpose of goodness and beauty.'

A Serivice of Reparation.

Few events in recent years have been more detrimental to Christian unity and theological liberalism in this country than the protest made by the York Convocation against Unitarians being invited to preach in Liverpool Cathedral. We are glad to observe that the authorities of Liverpool Cathedral, who deeply resented this protest, celebrated on Sunday, June 6th, a notable Service of Reparation. The *Times* of June 7th reports the Dean of Liverpool as saying:

> 'The service was designed to avoid the disquiet which some good people feel if ministers of other Churches are invited to take part in a regular service of the Church of England or to preach in an Anglican pulpit. On the other hand, there is a vast body of Christians to whom it is intolerable that those who worship the one Divine Father and acknowledge the same Lord of their lives should never be able to do so together and publicly. Accordingly the service in Liverpool Cathe-

dral yesterday afternoon was one of worship, of prayer and praise, and of affirmation of the deep unity which exists, with solemn recollection of representative Christians who have striven to increase it.

'The service was not divided into parts which were allocated to ministers of various denominations: all was done by groups of clergymen and ministers, the congregation responding. Those present were drawn from all churches in Liverpool calling themselves Christian, the Roman Catholic Church excepted. One hundred and seventy-three such congregations were represented; 161 ordained clergymen and ministers took part, and the Cathedral choir was assisted by some 1,955 voices composed of selected representatives from the choirs of all churches in Liverpool professing the Christian name, and only the limitations of the space provided by the Cathedral in its present stage of erection prevented the number from being much larger; in addition 219 holders of lay offices in the various Churches assisted at this service. The service marks a new experiment and adventure in the interests of Christian unity, and was broadcast throughout the Empire.'

Liverpool Cathedral, towards the building of which generous contributions have been made by citizens belonging to the Free Churches of that city, is a definitely liberal foundation and is intended to provide a spiritual home, not only for members of the established Church but for all the citizens of Liverpool, who desire to avail themselves of its services. In view of the increasing menace to the unity of the religious, civic and social life of Liverpool due to the powerful and closely-organized Roman Catholic community in that city, it is of particular importance that all members of the Reformed Churches there should draw more closely together and work in co-operation. The Liverpool Cathedral authorities have once again shewn a becoming courage and initiative in organizing a great unifying religious service. What we, as Modern Churchmen, cannot but ask is why such united Christian services should not become a regular practice in all our Cathedral cities and why the Diocesan Bishops should not encourage them? Such services would constitute an influential factor in securing reunion.

THE NECESSITY OF MODERNISM*

By the Right Rev. J. W. Hunkin, D.D., O.B.E., M.C.,
Bishop of Truro.

'Through him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father' (*Ephes.* ii, 18).

LET me begin by quoting some words from an address given by that great man Robert Bridges, the late Poet Laureate, to the Tredegar and District Co-operative Society on November 22nd, 1917:

> 'The Christian churches will not leave the old ruts. The Pope still hankers after temporal power, and to get it would crown Tiglath-Pileser in St. Peter's, while our Protestant Church still begins its morning devotions by singing of "God swearing in his wrath that his people should not enter into his rest."
>
> 'Now in the religion of Christ, which, whether we will it or not, whether we know it or not, is deeply ingrain'd in our heart's reverence and the life of our souls, and is ever rebuking and overruling our conduct — in this world-conquering Christianity the essentials are love and unity and brotherhood. But look at the Protestant sects, all quarrelling about crude absurdities and ridiculous unessentials. And ask yourselves how the Church shall be purify'd and edify'd when those who should compose it remain outside of it.'

In the face of such a situation, the most hopeful line to take is the line of a reverent and reasonable Modernism. Such Modernism has a gospel to preach, good news to proclaim. This was borne in upon me in an unforgettable manner one evening in May, 1924, as I sat in a room on the top floor of that beautiful middle court of St. John's College, Cambridge, and listened to an address by the late Canon J. M. Wilson, once Senior Wrangler, formerly Headmaster of Clifton, all his life a stout champion of progressive thought. He was an old man then, with a long white beard. He looked like a prophet; he spoke like a prophet.

His address led up to the words of my text — that indeed is why I have chosen them to-night.

> 'I am only saying,' said Canon Wilson, 'what St. Paul said in words I used to pass over as saying nothing particular, "*Through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father.*" These words now grip me. I declare that they contain enough theology for me. I want no more. *Through Christ* — that is by loving, serving, follow-

* The sermon preached in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields on May 27th, 1937, at the annual gathering of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

ing, studying, adoring Christ, men have got, and we may and do get, to understand and love God — *we have access* to God. And we do this *by one Spirit* . . .

'I believe and am sure (and that is my outlook and hope for theology) that Jesus Christ is the Way, the Truth and the Life; and that our access to God is most surely made through sharing and showing the Spirit of God which was manifested in Him.'

'Through Christ' . . . 'by one Spirit' — these must not be thought of as two separate methods of access to the Father: they are one and the same.

In addressing a meeting of the Christian Social Union at Manchester towards the end of November, 1895, Bishop Westcott took as his subject 'The Christian Law.'

'But what,' he asked, 'is "the Christian Law"? We are often reminded that Christ left no code of Commandments. It is in Him — in His Person and His work — the Law lies. He has given, indeed, for our instruction some applications of the negative precepts of the Decalogue to the New Order. He has added some illustrations of positive duties — almsgiving, prayer, fasting. He has set up an ideal and a motive for life; and at the same time He has endowed His Church with spiritual power, and has promised that the Paraclete, sent in His Name, shall guide it into all the Truth.

'The Christian Law, then, is the embodiment of the Truth for action in forms answering to the conditions of society from age to age. The embodiment takes place slowly, and it can never be complete. It is impossible for us to rest indolently in the conclusions of the past. In each generation the obligation is laid on Christians to bring new problems of conduct and duty into the Divine light, and to find their solution under the teaching of the Spirit.

'The unceasing effort to fulfil the obligation establishes the highest prerogative of man, and manifests the life of the Church. From this effort there can be no release; and the effort itself becomes more difficult as human relations grow fuller, wider, more complex.'

'*It is impossible to rest indolently in the conclusions of the past.*' And this applies not only to problems of conduct but to other problems as well: problems of history and doctrine, for example. Sustained by true religion — that is, if I may quote again from the address of Robert Bridges to which I have already referred, 'the conviction and habit of a personal communion between the soul and God' — strengthened and calmed and inspired by such personal communion, and in humble dependence on the Divine Spirit, we have to think out the various problems—moral, historical, doctrinal—with which we are confronted to-day.

It is in accordance with the Christian conception of the greatness and love of God to believe that the help of the Divine

Spirit is never withheld whenever and wherever an honest thinker is at work. We are in urgent need of straightforward and honest thinking in all the great subjects with which the Church has a vital concern.

In the realm of conduct a danger is appearing on the horizon: the danger that a body of ecclesiastics, claiming the authority of the Church, might decide by a majority to issue a pronouncement declaring certain actions wrong which are not condemned by the conscience of the educated laity. After all, conscience, or the moral consciousness, is simply the mind making moral judgments. It is no special faculty to be directed by specially ecclesiastical influences. Our great ethical writers, from Bishop Butler to the late Dean Rashdall and Professor Sorley, have been courageous, honest, balanced thinkers, trusting in the Holy Spirit of God, but not expecting their thought to be directed by grace specially communicated along defined ecclesiastical channels. Some of you may remember how Rashdall used to riddle 'the normal channel' theory of the reception of divine grace. It is indeed too narrow a theory to fit the facts.

Or again, let us turn for a moment to the field of historical investigation. It is very refreshing to find an Anglo-Catholic writer of such repute as Father A. G. Hebert insisting that historical results are to be accepted, not on the authority of the Church, but as the result of historical inquiry. Let me quote his exact words (*Liturgy and Society*, p. 105):

> 'This evasion of the appeal to history in panic at the seeming results of Biblical criticism has given rise to the Fundamentalist movement. The same fear appears to underlie the answers of the Biblical Commission appointed by Pope Pius X; thus it was affirmed on 27 June, 1906, that Moses must be held to be the author of the Pentateuch, at least substantially; and on 19 June, 1911, that Matthew the Apostle is the author of the first Gospel, that this Gospel was the first of the synoptic Gospels to be written, and was written in Aramaic, that Mark was the author of *Mark* xvi, 9-20, that the "two-document" theory of the Synoptic problem is in error. It is a good thing that these pronouncements are probably not infallible; for they all condemn results of historical criticism which may now reasonably be regarded as certain, as far as they go. But the point is, that if historical results such as these are to be accepted or rejected on the authority of the Church, and not as the result of historical inquiry, the appeal of the Church to history has been abandoned, and with it the principle of the Incarnation.'

This is true Modernism, and what Modernists have to do is to help one another to investigate the historical evidence and make sure that there is no insistence on the acceptance of any event as a historical fact for which there is not adequate historical evidence.

In all such investigations we shall pray for the light and leading of the Divine Spirit, and we shall use our best endeavours to examine without prejudice and without fear. Such an examination has already been to a large extent effected as far as the Old Testament is concerned, and the results have been widely accepted by our Church. But our Church is not nearly so familiar with the results of modern research on the New Testament, nor have these results yet been generally understood and absorbed.

I should now pass to the field of Christian doctrine, and try to say a few words about that, were it not that the Archbishop's Doctrinal Commission will, we hope, soon be publishing its report; and I am sure that that report will give us real help in facing a situation which has become admittedly difficult. Here again it is by hard thinking under the ever-present inspiration of the Holy Spirit that we hope to arrive at a less inadequate conception of God All-Sovereign and His relations with His children and all His creatures.

In the title of my address I ventured to refer Modernism as a necessity. Now, at its conclusion, I should like to put in a plea for wider support for a union of Modern Churchmen like that under whose auspices we have met to-day.

As things are, independent thinking and outspoken conference on theological subjects are regarded in many quarters with uneasiness and suspicion. It is therefore most desirable that those who recognize the duty of thinking freely and frankly on these important matters should stand together and support one another.

The Union should be broad enough to include thinkers of various schools, so long only as they are endeavouring to discover and face the facts and are genuinely prepared where necessary to revise the conclusions of the past. Such breadth is, I believe, intended in the Modern Churchmen's Union, and I hope it will be increasingly evident in the future.

A Union of this kind should provide conferences on important subjects: it should have a journal where fresh suggestions can be published for examination and discussion: and it should be able to make pronouncements on important occasions.

Our Union has in effect — I need not go into technicalities of organization, which are as a matter of fact under consideration — all these advantages. We have had a series of valuable conferences over a number of years, with published contributions of great interest. The *Modern Churchman* has done splendid service and is read far beyond the bounds of the actual membership of the Union. From time to time the Union has been able to make representations on important subjects, sometimes in conjunction with other societies.

Of course there have been mistakes: there is room on all sides for improvement. It is very desirable that the Annual Conference should receive still more support from the members of the Union and that its connexion with the Union should be strengthened. It is very desirable that the *Modern Churchman* should have as comprehensive a regard as possible for progressive thinkers of various types. It is very desirable that the Council of the Union should be strictly economical in its utterances, and err rather on the side of silence than of outspokenness on matters on which the Union itself contains a substantial minority of dissent. Happily our eyes are open to all these points, and improvements can and will be effected in all these directions. And so I confidently and earnestly appeal this evening for a Union which has already done so much, and which I am confident has a field of still greater usefulness before it in the future.

The battle for reasonable liberty of thought in the Church of England has resulted in the capture of the objective. The trench has been won: but we have yet to dig ourselves in and prepare for counter-attack. We are not yet beyond the danger of counter-attack, and it behoves all of us who have a concern for Freedom and Truth to fortify the position together.

AN AUSTRALIAN'S REFLECTIONS ON ANTHOLOGIES

By the Rev. K. T. Henderson, M.A., B.Litt.,
Author of *Khaki and Cassock, Christian Tradition and Australian Outlook.*

I HAVE a habit of collecting anthologies. The other day, searching vainly for some dimly-remembered passage for a member of my family, I counted with mingled vanity and shame, twenty-six of them in the heap at my feet nearly all produced in the past few years. I did not set out to buy twenty-six of these books, nor have I a collector's itch to possess every one produced. It just happens that I have difficulty in refusing a new one when it is offered to me, lest it should contain good stuff, otherwise inaccessible. The hobby has become expensive, for good anthologies have been pouring from the press recently. As a consequence I have been asking myself whether the collecting of anthologies is a good habit.

I know there is an element of dissipation and infirmity in it. These twenty-six books are made up of beautiful shining fragments, each fragment containing some luminous idea expressed perfectly and for ever. But fragments they are, and fragmentary reading may become a subtle habit weakening the will and sapping the energy which should concentrate on whole solid books. If such a reader thinks he can get the high moments of Jeremy Taylor, Donne or Auden in anthologies, he is less inclined to read the classic which would give him a real understanding. A diet of fiery particles is a strain on the mental digestion; it is never possible to read an anthology for a long period. Its first delight quickly becomes fatiguing.

It would be idle to pretend that this kind of reading is restful. It is impossible to pass, say, from the cool and final wisdom of Aristotle to the inner conflicts and strivings of Mark Rutherford, or from the quiet and penetrating sympathy of Amiel to the cloud-encompassed lightnings and thunderings of the 'fallen angel' Ivan, in the *Brothers Karamazov*, without a mental bump. The only right way to enjoy an anthology is to read it during brief intervals of leisure.

In opening an anthology some people feel that they are

entering upon a conducted tour of a super-strenuous paradise wherein they are expected to converse intelligently with Mahomet at his brightest at one instant, and Shelley in his most supercharged moments the next. The only thing to do, they think, is to put on a mental mood of impersonal impassive good manners and take a detached well-bred interest in all that is being said. But that is not the spirit in which to gain what a good anthology has to give. The discriminating reader will come across much that merely interests him, some selections that make no appeal, but every now and again he will light upon some passage that 'speaks to his condition,' something said this year or 2,000 years ago that utters clearly and finally an idea that he has been dimly groping for, a feeling fugitive and dimly realized, a truth needed for the day's living, but unsurely possessed because not clearly formulated to the understanding. Then the dim light smoking in a distant corner of the mind has its wick turned up, and is placed firmly on the lamp-stand in the middle of the room. Many of our ideals that get a dusty answer from life are hard to hold. They gain new reality and conviction when they bring us great companions.

The man who has been occupied with some special interest, whether it be a private problem or a general topic, is often amazed to find how quietly and unobtrusively an anthology seems to offer him just what the great travellers through the same country have themselves experienced. The reader's mind is a plate sensitized by its own interest to certain rays of light. I had been struggling with the problem of the power of religion to shape our future civilization, and within a few days after I had written what I have written, my browsing had brought me, by chance it seems, apposite reflections from Lucretius, Trehearne (whose prose poem on Love is almost worthy to stand beside St. Paul's), Harnack, Gerald Heard, and A. N. Whitehead.

The manifold wisdom of the spirit knows no limit of time or space or circumstance. How comes it that Robert Leighton — calm, charitable and noble — was Archbishop of Glasgow in the bitter Scotland of 1684? Or that the blind and deaf Helen Keller can say:

> 'I believe that God is in me as the sun is in the colour and fragrance of a flower — the Light in my darkness, the Voice in my silence.'

It would seem that the outpouring of anthologies to-day is intended to meet the modern cry for a spiritual faith which is not shackled by a dogmatic system.

An occasional lightning flash from von Hügel, Hegel, or Walter Lippmann, making vivid the truths which abide in the particular moment, helps to steady the reader's principles and so enables him to interpret aright the changes and chances of this mortal life. It is the boon of anthologies that they provide us with the blessed company of those who caught some personal vision of truth, and spoke it for ever.

'Escape literature' murmurs the academic intellectual. The evidence does not sustain that charge. If you look through the index of any notable collection made since Robert Bridges started the fashion with his *Spirit of Man*, you will notice that nearly all the writers represented there in brief paragraphs have a very solid body of work to their credit. The passage selected has flared up, far more often than not, from the midst of a long sustained and serious argument to which the writer has given all that he has achieved. Authors who try to be 'pretty' and 'brilliant' do not succeed to any extent in catching the eye of our modern anthologist. Usually the serious anthologist is vitally interested in the fighting destinies of man, and his ear is quick to catch the battle cries of those who have won through.

The interested reader of anthologies may reasonably expect the question, 'Which collection do you consider the best?' It is an unanswerable question because it is too personal. In reply, it is only possible to name the anthology one turns to oftenest. For sheer consistency in pure beauty I think I should still rank highest the first of the modern family, Robert Bridges' *Spirit of man*. His eccentricities of choice happen to 'find' me. About one-fifth of it is in French, and these selections include many gems which would be hard to find for oneself in the voluminous diaries of Amiel. Gerald Bullett's recent and much smaller *Testament of Light* is a vigorous and exquisite collection ranging from Lao-Tze to Lascelles Abercrombie. The anonymous *Christ Triumphant*,[1] with a Preface by Geoffrey Allen, is a more specifically Christian anthology of great religious experiences,

[1] *Christ Triumphant*, an anthology of Greek Christian experiences compiled by N.G. Foreword by Geoffrey Allen. Allen & Unwin. 5/-. 1934.

marked by their note of intimacy. *Inner Light*, the work of several collectors, is a noble devotional anthology. Unique of its kind is the breezy, informal collection entitled *Fiery Grains*, compiled by H. R. L. Sheppard and H. L. Marshall. This anthology takes one into many homely situations such as the doctor's waiting room, the tennis court, the kitchen, the trippers' char-a-banc. Gollancz has specialized in anthologies. For lighter general reading Arthur Stanley's *Bedside Book*, the *Week-End Book*, Armstrong's *Major Pleasures of Life* and Rose Macaulay's *Minor Pleasures of Life* are very pleasant company.

My two latest acquired anthologies are Stanley's *The Testament of Man* and Dean Inge's *Freedom, Love and Truth*.[2] Both are outstanding of their kind. Concerning the Stanley anthology I can say nothing higher than that I paid 11/3 for it in Australia, and of Inge no tribute greater than that I should have felt compelled to pay whatever the Australian bookseller might have asked. The usual method of reviewing an anthology is to complain about what it does not contain. I cannot find it in my heart to do this of either. Stanley, a master of the art, is wonderfully catholic in his sympathies and an amazing explorer. In time his selections range through the whole span of recorded speech from the seventh century B.C. to the 'Listener' of a few months ago, and in space—well, he had only one planet to choose from after all.

Dr. Inge's collection I find a quieter and steadier companion than any of the others. He has not been afraid of length in choosing his selections, and the reader's attention is therefore given longer and more satisfying spans to work on. The strenuous sanity of the mystical philosopher is given room to develop itself. The philosophers, ancient and modern, are represented in passages that glow with illumination rather than glitter with epigrams, and the great moments of many forgotten worthies are discovered. Dr. Inge has produced a personal supplementary Bible for those who are like-minded.

[2] *Freedom, Love and Truth*, an anthology of the Christian Life by W. R. Inge. Longmans. 12/6. 1936.

Love and Death, an anthology compiled by R. U. Somervell. Methuen and Co. 1934.

The Heavenly Vision, an anthology compiled by P. T. Wood. S.C.M. 1935. 5/-.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW OF THE ATONEMENT

IS the doctrine about sin and the Atonement commonly taught by the Church in accordance with and justified by the teaching of Christ?

As this doctrine occupies a more prominent position in the public offices, the books of private devotion, and the utterances from the pulpit than any other one subject, the question is of the utmost importance to anyone who desires to be a follower of Christ.

It is true that sin is scarcely mentioned in the Creeds, and the Atonement is not mentioned explicitly at all; but it would be difficult to deny the cardinal position that the sin of man and the redemption by Jesus Christ holds in the Church.

I.

What then is the Church doctrine on the subject? It may perhaps be stated as follows:

Sin is lawlessness and rebellion against God's commands; and as such it separates man from God and incurs His wrath upon the sinner. To atone for this separation and to appease His anger, so that the sinner might be forgiven and taken back into His favour, God required a reparation and propitiation, by the perfect obedience from birth and throughout life of His incarnate Son, Whose obedience should be consummated by a sacrificial death. By such means alone could man be redeemed from the everlasting penalties of his sin.

The cost of the redemption of man from the penalty of sin, *viz.*, the death of the incarnate Son of God, is thus a gauge or measure of the awful nature of sin and of its appalling results.

Man's redemption, however, is not completed by the act of God on his behalf: it requires (so the Church teaches) an act of man himself. Each man must, before he dies, repent of his sins and feel sorrow for having committed them. And if he also has faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, then God will accept his repentance, and for the sake of His Son's atonement, man will

be forgiven and the guilt of his sins and their everlasting penalty will be done away.

This appears to be the teaching of the Church about the forgiveness of sin. There remains to be stated the view of the Church as to the way in which man does actually sin — *what constitutes sin* in man.

Sin is twofold — Original and Actual: the former is a taint inherent in every person at birth by virtue of his descent from Adam; the latter is the result of an individual's wilful act, contravening in the letter or the spirit some commandment of God.

II.

Does the teaching of Christ warrant the Church in teaching the above doctrine? Are these doctrines compatible with His revelation of God as a Father, or with His teaching about forgiveness?

If we are to have a correct view of the way in which Christ regarded sin, it must be one that fits in with the general character of His teaching, and it must not depend upon isolated passages of doubtful interpretation.

From a general survey, then, of Christ's teaching, can it be asserted that He represented God as so offended by sin that He required any reparation or propitiation before He could or would forgive it? Did Christ represent Himself as about to pay, by the outpouring of His blood and by His death, a penalty due to God by man for sin? Does He teach that He will redeem man from the everlasting consequences after death of his sin? Can it be said that He was anxious to make His hearers realize the guilt of sin?

The answer to each of these questions is surely in the negative. This does not mean that Christ thought sin unimportant, or that man had no need of forgiveness: far from it — He taught His hearers to pray for forgiveness of their trespasses. His view of the character of sin was far other than that taught by the Church.

III.

The key to Christ's teaching is to be found in His allegorical description of the Judgment at His Coming, when reward and punishment (whatever that may mean) will be meted out. What

are the grounds for the condemnation of 'the goats'? *Not* that they had committed murder or adultery, or had stolen or lied; *not* that they had not confessed their sins; *not* that they had declined to accept His redemption. The only ground for their condemnation is that *they had not performed kind actions*; they had not tended the sick, they had not fed the hungry, etc. Omission to live according to the law of love is the essence of sin.

Man is, on one side of his nature, animal; and while under the influence of his passions, offences against the law of love—adultery, murder, etc.—would necessarily occur. These offences would be forgiven on one condition alone. Men must forgive each other their trespasses without limit; and then the Father would forgive them their trespasses without limit. But man is not always under the sway of his animal nature; his higher nature often has free play. Then is the dangerous time for him. An opportunity comes for helping in some way a fellow man, and no strong animal passion intervenes to blind him: will he do it? If he will not, he is liable to the condemnation of 'the goats.'

Is not this the meaning of Christ's teaching in His conversation with the rich young man (*Luke* xviii, 18)? This young man had kept all the commandments from his youth up; but that was not sufficient to inherit eternal life. He lacked one thing—an essential thing—he had lived for himself, and spent his money on himself; he had omitted to live for others and to do kind acts. The same teaching was enforced when a lawyer asked what he should do to inherit eternal life (*Luke* x, 25). Christ told him to love God with all his heart and his neighbour as himself; as an example of love to a neighbour, Christ told of a man ministering to a complete stranger who was wounded and ill.

IV.

Did not Christ then die 'for man' and in order to effect his redemption from sin? Yes, certainly. But He died to redeem man from sin *in this life on earth*, and not from the consequences of sin in a future state of existence by paying a penalty on man's behalf. He came on earth to reveal God as a Father and to establish His Kingdom. This Kingdom was to begin on earth and to be perfected in heaven: its only law, which was also

its life, is the law of love; love to God because He is man's Father! love to man because men are brothers, children of one Father. If every man lived in this world according to the law of love, mankind would be practically sinless, and the world would be redeemed from sin. Christ taught, both by example and precept, that man should so live. Moreover He Himself was prepared to, and did as a fact die an agonizing death rather than forego teaching an ideal of life which inevitably brought Him into violent conflict with the leaders of the Jewish religion.

V.

It is true that Christ prefaced His announcement of the establishment of 'the Kingdom of God' by the word 'repent.' This is generally taken to mean, 'Sorrow for your sins and turn away from them.' There are two Greek words in the New Testament translated 'repent.' The one, with which Christ's teaching commences, signifies a change of intention followed by action: the other indicates sorrow. Both are found contrasted in *II Cor.* vii, 10. The meaning of Christ's words in announcing the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven may be given as follows:

'You are walking in the wrong direction, having as your goal your own self-interest; turn round, and walk in the opposite direction, where lies the Kingdom of Heaven, which I am come to initiate on earth, where the rule of life is to be the subordination of self-interest to the interests of others, according to the law of love.'

VI.

How comes it, then, that the Church has taught for so many centuries a doctrine about sin and its atonement at variance with the teaching of Christ Himself? This is largely due to the Primitive Christian teachers in their attempts to explain the death of Christ. Of these Primitive Jewish Christian teachers St. Paul was the most eminent. Here are some of St. Paul's statements about sin and its atonement by Christ's death:

> For He (God) hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. *II Cor.* v, 21.
>
> As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. *Rom.* vi, 19.
>
> By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. *Rom.* v, 12.

There is one God, one Mediator also between God and man, Himself Man, Jesus Christ, Who gave Himself a ransom for all. *I Tim.* ii, 5.

Being now justified by His Blood, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through Him. *Rom.* v, 9.

For I delivered unto you first of all . . . how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. *I Cor.* xv, 3.

For it was the good pleasure of the Father . . . through Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, having made peace through the Blood of His Cross. *Col.* i, 19, 20.

But now in Jesus Christ ye that once were far off are made nigh in the Blood of Christ. *Eph.* ii, 13.

Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, Whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, by His Blood. *Rom.* iii, 24.

In Whom we have our redemption through His Blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses. *Eph.* i, 7.

Jesus Christ, Who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption. *I Cor.* i, 30.

And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind, in your evil works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death. *Col.* i, 21.

Are statements such as these to be found in Christ's teaching?

VII.

Christ's teaching is so simple, so lovely, so convincing. What was it? God is your Father, and you are brothers. Turn away (*repent*) from your old selfish rule of life, and live always according to the dictates of love. Always do to others as you would wish others to do to you, if the positions were reversed. Your life in this world would then be redeemed from all sin. I am prepared to die, and I shall die a cruel death, to effect by my teaching and example this redemption. But you must always remember Me after I am dead, or else my teaching and example will perish. Therefore I institute this Memorial of Me. My teaching is universal for the whole of mankind; go therefore and make disciples of every nation.

Would not the world accept this teaching, and act upon it much more than it does, if it were made the basis of Christianity? The world has never tried the law of Love that Christ taught, as a cure for its ills! If the Church preached it, and the Fatherhood of God, with all its might, together with the Sacramental Memorial of Christ's life and death as its invariable accompaniment, perhaps the world might become Christian for the first time in its history.

GEORGE A. BYRON.

TRAGEDY OF AN INTELLECTUAL

By Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

THERE lies before us a new Life of the Emperor Julian,[1] a man who, critical of the tendencies of his day, looked back to a culture which he loved, but which had long been in decay. The Apostate, as he was called by the Christians who vilified him, indeed illustrates what may be called the tragedy of the intellectual — the man who worships an anachronism, who turns his back on the future because its beginnings seem raw and ugly in comparison with the dignity and beauty of the past.

Cultures wax old and vanish (or rather, they sometimes hesitate to vanish), and nothing is spiritually more tragic than for a man to be soaked in a culture which belongs to yesterday and has no future. Such an individual is isolated from his contemporaries, and may become soured. The past contains his spiritual values; and he may lack the vitality and faith to cut his losses and let the dead bury their dead. *Tendebant manus*, said Virgil of the dead; few can resist those outstretched arms. Not every man richly equipped with a dead culture can follow the example of St. Paul, and account it all 'but dung' — manure for future crops.

The fourth century, the age of Julian, was about as unfavourable an environment for the intellectual as it is possible to imagine. When Julian was born (331) over three centuries and a half (the time which separates us from Charles I) had elapsed since Augustus had converted Rome into a Totalitarian State, and over half a century since Diocletian (284) had clamped down on the world the vice of an Oriental despotism which crushed out the last remnants of individual freedom. We can best picture what kind of world it was by imagining a Europe which had for two generations been under the heel of Hitler or Stalin — and was not revolting against it, but only weary, devitalized, and in despair. Such was the age of Julian, an age practically without life. Can we wonder that an intellectual

[1] *Julian the Apostate and the Rise of Christianity*. By F. A. Ridley. Watts & Co. 15/- (1937).

should direct his pathetic gaze on the past, which could hardly be *more* dead than the present!

Julian's boyhood could scarcely be described as happy. He was the son of Julius Constantius, half-brother of the Emperor Constantine. Soon after the death of Constantine in 337, the Emperor Constantius, in the fashion of the Orient, removed potential rivals by murdering a number of relatives, amongst whom were Julian's father and one of his half-brothers. Julian himself, aged six, and another half-brother Gallus, aged twelve, were allowed to survive — for the time being, until the question of throne or scaffold (there was no third choice) should be decided.

The retreat chosen for Julian was Nicomedia, where he was put in charge of the bishop of that city, Eusebius, a distant relative of the Imperial house, and infected with Arian opinions. Here his education was entrusted to a Scythian eunuch Mardonius, a Christian,[2] and a former tutor in Homer and Hesiod of the lad's mother Basilina. In a letter written in manhood while conducting his brilliant campaigns in Gaul, Julian speaks of the 'anguish' he felt when he left this preceptor,[3] while in his *Misopogon*, a satire written on the luxurious inhabitants of Antioch immediately before his fatal Persian campaign, he says that Mardonius was 'of all men most responsible for my way of life.' These years with the kindly old tutor cannot have been altogether unhappy, especially as the lad used to visit his grandmother's estate in Bithynia, which is described in one of his letters and must have been a delightful spot. Here he would lie on a thyme-covered hill with a book, and look out over the sea.

But this comparatively happy time ended too soon. When Julian was fourteen, he and his half-brother Gallus were interned by the jealous Emperor in the lonely castle of Macellum in Cappadocia.

[2] Mr. Ridley (p. 114) says that Mardonius was 'an ardent pagan.' That he was an admirer of the Greek classics is certain, but Mr. Ridley supplies no other evidence.

[3] 'For everything flashed across my mind at once; the labours that we shared and endured together; our unfeigned and candid conversation; our innocent and upright intercourse; our co-operation in all that was good; our equally-matched and never-repented zeal and eagerness in opposing evildoers.'—*Oration* 8, 241 c.

'How shall I describe the six years we spent there?' he wrote long afterwards:

> 'We lived as though on the estate of a stranger, and were watched as though we were in some Persian garrison, since no stranger came to see us and not one of our old friends was allowed to visit us; so that we lived shut off from every liberal study and from all free intercourse, in a glittering servitude.' [4]

Julian attributes Gallus' subsequent cruelty and harshness of disposition to this trying experience. As for himself, 'The gods by means of philosophy caused me to remain untouched by it and unharmed.' The work of Mardonius had been well done. The imprisoned scholar was able to borrow books from George of Cappadocia, who later became Bishop of Alexandria and was murdered by the mob.

But at last, when Julian was now twenty years old (351), the two brothers, so different in character, were released. Gallus was raised to the rank of Caesar, understudy to the Emperor. Set to govern the provinces of the East, he embarked on a four years' reign of terror. Julian followed his bent and devoted himself to study, first at Pergamon with two disciples of Iamblicus the Neoplatonist, and later at Ephesus, where he had heard of the marvels wrought by Maximus the theurgist. For the rest of his life, Julian was an ardent disciple of this man.[5]

In 354 Gallus was summoned from the East to Milan by the jealous Emperor, and there beheaded. One of the brothers having thus been disposed of, Constantius sent for the other, and Julian came to Milan, the capital of the Western Empire. Here he was in no small danger of following his unamiable half-brother to the block, but was saved by the intercessions of the Emperor's wife, Eusebia, who, after seven months' suspense, secured him his single audience with the Emperor. Constantius may have thought there was little to be feared from this bookish scholar, and, perhaps with contempt, packed him off to Athens to pursue his studies. Among his fellow-students here were Gregory Nazianzen, who after his death wrote bitter invectives

[4] *Letter to the Athenians*. This and other quotations are from Dr. W. C. Wright's translation in the Loeb Classics.

[5] 'The Syrian Neoplatonism of the fourth Christian century which followed the teachings of Iamblicus was a religion rather than a philosophy, and was well suited to Julian's love of the mystical and marvellous.' W. C. Wright. Introduction to Vol. III of the Loeb edition of Julian's works.

against his former comrade, and Basil the Great. Julian's stay at Athens was brief — only two months, but it is almost certain that at this time he was initiated into the Mysteries at Eleusis. His abandonment of Christianity, however, preceded this (albeit private, of necessity), for in a letter written in 362, he says that for twelve years, 'by the grace of the gods,' he had ceased to be a Christian.

But in two months the dreaded summons came to return to Milan. In his manifesto sent to the Senate and People of Athens six years later, after his rupture with Constantius, Julian describes his feelings on this melancholy occasion, at the thought that he must now consent 'to dwell under the same roof with those whom I knew to have ruined my whole family, and who, I suspected, would before long plot against myself also.' However, to have refused would have meant certain death, and things turned out better than he feared; for after a couple of months' suspense, he was raised to the rank of Caesar — the rank which had proved fatal to Gallus — married to the Emperor's sister Helena, a lady much older than himself, and entrusted with the formidable task of pacifying the Gallic provinces. He set out on 1st December, 355, with a library of books which Eusebia had given him, and a small troop of 360 men who, as he observed later, 'only knew how to pray.'

Gaul was overrun at the time by hordes of Germans whom Constantius had rashly invited to assist him in defeating his rival Magnentius. These barbarians had destroyed the Roman forts along the Rhine, and the whole country was at their mercy. Whether Constantius sent Julian to Gaul with the same motives as David sent Uriah the Hittite into battle must remain obscure. Mr. Ridley is quite sure that this was the case, and it seems certain that Julian was continually being thwarted and hindered by officers sent by the Emperor to keep an eye on him. Letters had been sent with express orders that they were to watch him 'as vigilantly as they did the enemy.' This suspicious policy moderated a little after the first winter, but Constantius' attitude never ceased to be one of suspicion and jealousy.

The fact was that this awkward, retiring scholar, whom on one occasion the wits at the Milan court had dressed up in a soldier's equipment so as to make fun of him, proved a resolute,

intelligent, and successful general. It took him five years of campaigning to clear up the situation, but when he had finished, not a single German was left on the wrong side of the Rhine. One cannot avoid a comparison with T. E. Lawrence — the scholar becoming man of action.

And not only was Julian a fine soldier, he was also a fine administrator. Not only did he recover 20,000 Gauls held prisoner beyond the Rhine, expel the Germans, defeat new invaders, restore the Roman forts, cross the Rhine four times, and win the famous battle of Strasbourg, but he resisted the imposition of increased taxes upon the rescued provincials, and restored Gaul not only to security but to something like prosperity. Nor did this astonishing young man cease his studies while thus engaged; he still wrote, and corresponded with his philosopher friends. The man of action did not cease to be a man of ideas and ideals.

Such success could hardly be forgiven. Julian, now adored by army and provincials alike, became more than ever an object of imperial suspicion. To recall him would have been imprudent, but to deprive him of his troops seemed easy, and in the winter of 359-360 orders came that the finest of his soldiers, amounting to more than half his army of 23,000 men, were to cross the Alps for service in Persia. As the greater part of these men had been enlisted by Julian for home service in Gaul, they were naturally unwilling to face a campaign in distant Mesopotamia. Some of the required troops were also, at the moment, engaged in defending Britain against Picts and Scots, and could not well be spared. The result was that the men, while in winter quarters at Paris (Lutetia), mutinied, and surrounding Julian in his quarters, hailed him as Emperor. Hearing the shouts he prayed to Zeus for an omen, and received a sign that he should comply with their wishes. Coming out at dawn he was lifted up on a shield and crowned with a standard-bearer's chain. For another year he remained in Gaul, winning a victory over the Attuarii, and in January, 361, at Vienne, he took part in the feast of the Epiphany. Then in the summer of the same year began his famous march through the Hercynian forest and along the Danube to Nish, a march which Mr. Ridley compares to Marlborough's famous march in 1704 before Blenheim. The

difficulties of the route were incredible. Julian observed of this forest that it was 'the most strange and monstrous thing' he ever beheld. In those days large parts of Central Europe must have been like the North American wilderness.

Having thus reached the borders of the Eastern Empire, Julian sent manifestos to the Roman Senate, the Spartans, Corinthians and Athenians, justifying his conduct, and announcing his intention to restore the old religion. It is characteristic of Julian that he should have desired to appeal to cities which no longer counted for anything in his world, but which had counted for much in the past. Like many intellectuals, Julian was the slave of a *literary* culture, which nearly always involves a backward-looking attitude.

Constantius, conducting an ineffective campaign in Persia, could not do otherwise than accept his rival's challenge, and returned with his army to Europe. But while the world was waiting for the civil war to open, he died of a fever in Cilicia. 'Since he is now one of the blessed dead, may the earth lie lightly on him!' was the new Emperor's comment. Julian indulged in no wholesale butchery, but appointed a commission to try his enemies, especially those who had been accessory to the death of Gallus.

It was on the 11th December, 361, that Julian entered Constantinople in triumph. In February of the next year he proclaimed religious freedom in the Empire, and ordered the restoration of the temples — a decree which caused hardship to many, as those who had used those ancient buildings as stone quarries had to restore the material they had taken. He also recalled the ecclesiastics whom the Arian Constantius had exiled, amongst them Athanasius himself. Some difficulty was experienced in restoring all the old pagan ritual, as much of it had been forgotten, so Julian engaged the services of a distinguished antiquarian, in the fashion of those who seek to revive what is dead; in short, like Anglican clergy zealous for the Sarum Use.

The sad story of the fatal campaign in Persia is well known and may be read in the immortal pages of Gibbon. It was indeed characteristic of Julian that he should have fought the campaign at all. Was it essential to do so? Did 'imperial honour' demand it? Might not Sapor have been willing to conclude a satisfactory

peace, more favourable than that which Julian's successor Jovian had to make? Is it not possible that here again Julian's *literary* obsessions were his undoing? The Athenians and Spartans had fought the Persians, so why should not he? Persia was the enemy of the Hellene. There was not even the cold-blooded justification of the destruction of a trade rival which animated Cato in asking for the obliteration of Carthage. It was pure sentiment. There was plenty of room in the world for both Persia and the Empire, and it was foolish to fritter away in the East, forces which were needed to stem the tide of the barbarians preparing to flood the West.

For evidence of persecution of Christians by Julian we are dependant upon Gregory Nazianzen and the Church historians. Certainly some of his administrative measures, such as that which deprived the clergy of exemption from certain social liabilities and responsibilities, were aimed at the Christians. But to take away privileges is not quite the same thing as to persecute, though the sufferer may not see the distinction. Bishops were no longer given the free use of the public transport (including inns, horses, and mules), as had been their custom in rushing from one synod to another in the public interest. But such measures were mere pinpricks compared with the edict which excluded Christian teachers from education, a piece of propaganda technique not unworthy of Stalin himself. Christians were forbidden to read the pagan authors with their pupils, and since all education was based on such reading, it meant a complete veto on their teaching. Christian lecturers at Rome and Athens, as well as humbler teachers, had to resign. Ammianus, the pagan historian, always favourable to Julian, says of it that it was 'a harsh measure, and had better be buried in eternal silence.' It was an unprecedented step, belonging to the twentieth century rather than to the fourth.

> 'Henceforth,' writes Mr. Ridley, 'persecution was to pass from a shambles to a science. At that hour a new science entered history—the science of persecution. With the issue of Julian's famous edict the method of scientific propaganda, of Jesuitism and Bolshevism, was born. With its issue a new methodology entered history.'

Mr. Ridley is of the opinion that had Julian's life not been cut short, he would have been successful in exterminating Christianity.

> 'The whole higher education of the Empire would have been in pagan hands. It must be remembered that Julian was only thirty when he issued the edict. Had he survived into the fifth century, *a new generation would have grown up who knew nothing about Christianity.*'

Of course, the *Ifs* of history allow a wide latitude of conjecture. Yet we have to remember that by the latter half of the fourth century, the new religion was pretty well established. Moreover, paganism—even the Neo-platonism of Iamblichus—had now no vitality comparable to that possessed by the Christian Church. Even the head of a totalitarian state cannot bring back to life something that is dead. He might conceivably give it a semblance of life for a time, but that would be all. Mr. Ridley seems to us to exaggerate the power of the Roman State—admittedly great. He says that 'The State *was actually competent to decide the issue*' (italics his). Yet a few pages earlier he declares, quite rightly, that by the fourth century

> 'there were left two forces whose authority was alone real and omnipresent in that stagnant civilization: the one was the Empire of the Caesars; the other was the power of religion—a power congenial to, and stimulated by, the social conditions of that decaying culture and fear-haunted world.'

This analysis is sound. But of the two forces, the State and Religion; the former was not now competent to control the latter, in spite of its 'totalitarian' character. Ever since Severus, the State had been oppressive and regarded as such. A provincial's chief concern was to avoid being crushed by 'liturgies' and taxes—if he could (Mr. Ridley does not refer to Rostovtzeff's monumental work *The Social and Economic History of the Romna Empire*). Under Diocletian the position became far worse. Why did people go out into the Nitrian desert in hundreds and thousands if it was not to escape from a life which had become intolerable? The fact cannot be too strongly insisted upon that the State was *loathed*, just as it is loathed by large sections of the community in Russia, Italy, and Germany today. Any organization that could stand up to the State, or be in any degree independent of it, won automatically a large degree of loyalty and support, even though it might be secret.

Julian failed to perceive that the popularity of the Christian Church for many lay precisely in its being a 'state within a State.' Of course if he could have reformed the State, and set it

on a new basis, and made it beneficent instead of oppressive, he might have made men so in love with his State that they would have accepted his religion, as in the case of Augustus. But history does not repeat itself; the position of the Empire was now very different. It was in economic decay; even the human material was lacking. It was too late. It was the tragedy of Julian that he did not see that it was no good trying to strengthen the State by a revival of the old religion. That is what reactionaries are trying to do to-day, as always. The situation was that a new religion had come into existence, and this in its turn would create an entirely new *kind* of State. The old Imperial State was as dead as the old religion, though it would survive it a while longer.

Mr. Ridley writes from the standpoint of the 'rationalist,' and he regards it as a disaster that Julian did not live to 'liquidate' the Christian Church. But granting the possibility of such a consummation, had Julian lived, would this have been any gain from the rationalist point of view? Julian himself, as Mr. Ridley admits, was no rationalist. Would Mithras or Apollo really have been an improvement, from the rationalist standpoint, upon the Christ of Catholicism? True, the Christians were superstitious, but so was Julian, who believed in omens, dreams, miracles, and so on, like any other denizen of the fourth century. A devout pagan Empress strove to push, as a rival to Christ, Apollonius of Tyana, whose life, as she had it written by a literary hack, was stuffed with miracle. The opposition of Christianity did not come from rationalism — that creed was dead, more dead than paganism. The Christian Church in spite of its faults was in the fourth century the institution with most promise for the future.

We need not vilify Julian in the manner of Gregory Nazianzen, nor need we seek to depreciate him. He was certainly a great man, especially a great soldier and administrator. If he was not an original philosopher, few men have the gift to be that in any age. He was honest, he was courageous, he was public-spirited. He loathed cant, hypocrisy and graft. He even tried to eliminate graft from Constantinople, but was no more successful than those who have tried to eliminate it from New York.

BOOK REVIEWS

LIVING RELIGIONS COMPARED AND CRITICIZED*

This book is an attempt to show the movements of thought in the great religions of the world to-day, and deals in successive chapters with Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Sikhism, Confucianism and Shinto, Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Islam and Bahaism, and Christianity. From the purpose of the book it was necessary, not only to give an outline of the religions themselves, but also to describe all the recent movements within the religions. The idea is excellent, for it must be admitted that many books on the Comparative Study of Religions, by neglecting the latest phases of the religions, are apt to compare the religions as they were rather than as they are. But it is to be doubted whether any single author could possibly be so closely in touch with all these living religions as to do justice to them.

Some years ago, a few friends who had been reading Dr. Farquhar's *Modern Religious Movements in Hinduism* were discussing whether a similar book could be written for Christianity; and they came to three conclusions: first, that it would be very difficult to write; secondly, that it would be a very large book; and thirdly, that it would contain a great deal of matter of no particular importance. These conclusions come to mind in reading Prof. Widgery's book. In the first place, it is extremely difficult to give a fair account even of a single religion, and the difficulty is immensely increased when one tries to include all the modern movements. Secondly, the space allotted to each religion is so inadequate, for example, thirty-two pages to Christianity, thirty-two to Hinduism, and twenty-five to Zoroastrianism, that no expert in those religions can possibly be satisfied with the generalizations adopted. Thirdly, the desire to leave no modern movements out of account has resulted in the inclusion of many opinions which are probably of no lasting significance. The history of religion seems to show a tendency for all sorts of sects and heresies to arise as side branches, most of them destined to wither, and only a few to last any length of time, while the main body of the religion continues to grow as the trunk of the tree, modified to some slight extent by the opinions of the heretical sects. No one could deny that Prof. Widgery has collected an enormous amount of material; but most people, especially those expert in one or other of the religions, would question his judgment of the permanent values of the different facts and opinions. Bahaism, for instance, which made great progress in its early days, and excited the admiration of Prof. E. G. Browne for its constancy under persecution,

* *Living Religions and Modern Thought.* By Alban G. Widgery. (Williams and Norgate. 1936. 302 pages. 12/6.)

does not appear to be growing now. The Brahmo Samaj, as far as one can tell, is neither growing nor exerting any influence in India. It is even doubtful how far the Ahmadiyya Movement, in spite of all its impressive propaganda, will continue to exist as a separate sect, or will make a permanent contribution to Islam. The reason for this doubt is that it does not appear to have either spiritual experience or philosophical reasoning behind it. One of its journals dared to print the suggestion that the virgin birth of Jesus must be denied 'in the best interests of Islam,' thus contradicting the Qur'an; and it is difficult to see what basis they have for their beliefs beyond a desire to support some sort of Islam and to attack Christianity.

For the successful prosecution of the Comparative Study of Religions two apparently contradictory qualities are required, first a sympathy with each religion in turn, so as to discover the real mind of the devotees and the value of all that is good in the religion, and secondly an intolerance of error. This latter quality is essential for judgments of truth, and especially for anyone who would prophesy the future course of religions; and it is a quality in which this book is lacking. It is easy to be tolerant. It is easy to assume that every religion means the same when it speaks of good thoughts, good words, good deeds; that the name 'God' calls up to every human mind the same sort of ideas; that monotheisms only differ in the degree of their emphasis on the word 'one.' It is this false road of easy tolerance which leads to the belief that all religions are much the same.

The author's own view of the future of religion is succinctly expressed on page 279, 'The way to comprehensive truth and unity is not likely to be found in the present universal adoption of any one existing religion. There are no signs of any tendency to such adoption.' The reviewer's opinion, on the other hand, is that there is every sign of the tendency to the adoption of Christianity as the only religion in the world, opposed only by materialism and secularism, and that the Christianity of the future will not differ markedly from traditional Christianity. Probably the author would reply that the amazing growth of Christianity in India was offset by its failure in Russia and Germany. The answer to this objection is to be found by considering the causes of the drift away from organised religion, and of conversion from one religion to another. Generally speaking (and a review is bound to generalize even more than a book) the people who drift away from Christianity in the West are the less religious people, and they usually abandon religion altogether in favour of materialism or secularism. Those who leave Hinduism or Islam to become Christians are for the most part the more religious people who seek a fuller religious life in Christianity. At the same time numbers of the educated Hindus and Muslims drift away from their religions into secularism, but they almost always retain the name of Hindu or Muslim as a communal badge. The only conspicuous example in history of conversion from Christianity to another religion was the conversion of the greater part of the Asiatic Christians to Islam under the Caliphs. After a long study of this special case the re-

viewer became convinced that it was due to inherent weakness in their Christian life and thought, and in particular to their heathenish opinion that worldly success was a mark of the divine favour. In other words, before they went over to Islam they had already abandoned the Christian view of God.

As an example of the caution with which this book must be used the following passage from the chapter on Islam may be quoted (p. 198), 'Sometimes the greatness and the power of Allah have tended to overshadow the attributes of compassion and mercy, and an overwhelming dread of divine retribution has been engendered. Nevertheless an enumeration of the names applied to Allah is sufficient to show that in spite of the contentions of Christian critics of Islam such implied harshness is not the dominant character of the presentation.' The truth is that, whereas Muhammad in the Qur'an used the epithet *rahim* ('merciful') for God, which he had borrowed from the Syriac, and used other names such as 'loving' and 'peaceful,' his main emphasis was on the more transcendent and terrible side of God's character; and in the development of Islam, which took place in the first two or three centuries, it was this latter aspect of God which was emphasised almost to the exclusion of the rest. To prevent people arguing for the gentler side of God's character from the use of words like 'merciful' and 'loving' in the Qur'an, it was forbidden to use synonyms of these words, or to treat the words as having the same meaning as when applied to men.

The book will probably be chiefly read by people who are acquainted with modern Christian scholarship, and they will not need to have their attention drawn to the amazing lack of balance in the chapter on Christianity. But lest it should fall into the hands of readers who are not theologians, it is as well to point out that that chapter does not give a fair account of the conclusions of modern scholars. It is, for instance, quite untrue to say that Luke as compared with Mark shows a development of the miraculous in the story of Jesus. Quite apart from the textually doubtful words 'Son of God' in the first verse of Mark (omitted by *some* ancient authorities, not by 'ancient authorities,' as the author says), that Gospel presents a figure who is thoroughly divine and to whom no miracle is impossible. The other opinions of scholars quoted in the chapter are far from being representative of modern Christianity. It would be safe to say that in those circles where Christianity is most alive as an evangelizing and life-changing force, the opinions of scholars do not depart far from the old orthodox position. They are ready to reinterpret the old formulas, and express them in terms suited to modern philosophy, but in doing so they do not give Christ a lower place than the ancient creeds did.

This thought leads one to a general criticism, not only of this book, but of a great deal that has been written on the Comparative Study of Religions: it is not possible, by a study of the doctrines of a religion, and a comparison of them with the general opinions of the present day which

go by the name of 'modern thought,' to say that this or that doctrine is true or false. The only method of judgment is by the results in life; and then the individual must judge which sort of results he prefers. For instance, it might be said that one of the fruits of Christianity was self-sacrifice and humility, while one of the fruits of Islam (at any rate, of the Islam of Sir Muhammad Iqbal) is the production of supermen. The choice as to which is the true religion will depend on the choice between these two fruits.

L. E. Browne.

PASTOR NIEMOLLER*

Those who desire to understand what the German people are thinking and feeling to-day are faced with a difficult problem. For they see a nation that denies the spiritual bases of civilization, the disinterested search for truth and the elementary duties of man to man. The nation seems to have gone mad in the worship of itself. In the place of God it has set up the idol of the nation, which is now the great image on the plain of Shinar to which all must bow. The chief dogma of the cult is the fantastic delusion of race purity. Hitler receives the semi-divine honours of a minor deity, while a savage fanaticism forbids criticism and dissent.

Very few voices of protest are permitted to make themselves heard from inside Germany. Of these the most emphatic have come from the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. Practically the only others are those of the leaders of the German Protestant Churches, who have so far resisted the attempts of the State to make them the mouthpieces of the new worship of the nation, and have formed the Confessional Church, where the principles of the Christian religion are still maintained and taught.

Martin Niemöller, pastor of Berlin-Dahlem, is one of the best-known leaders of this movement, and two books from his pen, *From U-Boat to Pulpit* (Hodge; 8/6) and *First Commandment* (Hodge; 6/-), help one to envisage the situation as he sees it, and to understand his methods of facing it. The first of these volumes, his autobiography, shows him to us as a very brave, a very resourceful and a very lucky man. During the war he served in and later commanded submarines, which sank as much Allied shipping as any submarines in the German service. The most ruthless incident he described was the successful torpedoing of a French troopship; then, when the destroyer which had been escorting the ship went alongside to try to save as many as possible of the drowning soldiers, his submarine kept bobbing up its periscope here and there, to distract the destroyer from its work. But our author's conscience was troubled. His conclusion is that from the German point of view the submarine was right. War is war. The incident proved to him the 'final collapse of morality,' 'the impossi-

* *From U-Boat to Pulpit.* By Martin Niemöller. Translated by Commander D. H. Smith. (Hodge. 1936. 8/6.)

First Commandment. By Martin Niemöller. Translated by J. Lymburn. (Hodge. 1937. 6/-.)

bility of believing in a moral universe. In order to maintain faith in God 'one must believe in the forgiveness of sins.'

Pastor Niemöller is an uncompromising patriot. His patriotism is unqualified by considerations either of morality or of humanitarianism. This explains in part why he is still the pastor of Dahlem and not in a concentration camp. There have been Germans as brave as he, who have remained in Germany in order to protest against the injustices and the barbarities of the Hitler régime, for instance the Nobel Prize winner Herr Ossietsky. But Herr Ossietsky has spoken in the name of morality, humanity and pacifism; his defence of these principles has caused his condemnation by the rulers of Germany.

They have not so far dared to condemn Pastor Niemöller, or to prevent his preaching to his congregation at Dahlem, because his teaching largely repeats the teaching of Luther, and a nation which worships itself has not yet been able to repudiate this man, one of its most famous and most typical sons. One gets an idea of his teaching from *First Commandment*, a volume of sermons, preached at Dahlem between the years 1933 and 1935, and now translated into English. They are remarkable sermons, and thrilled the crowds who came to hear them. Through them one feels the strain of life in present-day Germany, and the crisis through which the Protestant Churches are passing. Their theology is like the 'desperado theology' of Barth and his followers. Their outlook is entirely 'otherworldly.' They teach 'the impossibility of believing in a moral universe.' 'The Kingdom of God to which we are called is not a Kingdom of this world.' We need the grace of God; 'and the grace of God is to be found only where God comes personally to me, so that I am likewise dealing personally with Him.' But sin sets a chasm between man and God, a chasm which only God can cross. God has done this in Jesus Christ, so that through repentance and faith man can now receive 'the forgiving love of the Lord Jesus Christ, which seeks me and bestows upon me the courage of faith, so that I dare hold fast to God.' The glad tidings of this forgiving love are the Word of God, which is to be found in the Bible.

Pastor Niemöller ignores the critical problems of modern Bible study. Again and again he strikes the distinctive notes of the 'theology of crisis.' The popularity of this theology on the Continent proves its value in facing difficult circumstances. But it does not make the same appeal to English Modernists, living in more normal conditions. It first declares that sin sets an impossible chasm between man and God, and then it attempts to cross this chasm by means of a mystical experience of repentance and faith, which is completed by the sense of union with the forgiving love of God in Jesus Christ. But this remains an unexplained miracle of grace. Religion is reduced to a mystical experience which is unintelligible to most men, because they do not share it.

These sermons are rather disappointing, because they teach that religion is the immediate experience of God *only*, an experience of faith *alone*, in

which neither reason nor the moral consciousness can share. Perhaps it is of more immediate interest to trace in them the course of the struggle of the Confessional Church against the efforts of the German State to make it the mouthpiece of its own ideology of race and nationality. Pastor Niemöller is a patriot, but he is also a Christian. 'This nation will either be a Christian nation, or it will cease to exist.' He says very little about definite acts of oppression and injustice committed by the State. He offers very little criticism of the ideology of race and nationality. He preaches the Christian duty of submission to political authority. 'The ruling power in the State is God's minister, provided by Him with full authority and instructions and answerable and responsible to Him — to Him, and not to us.' But he does envisage the possibility that it may be the duty of the Christian to disobey the State. 'We may possibly also have a right to disobedience; but this right comes into force only when we are asked to do wrong, and then this right immediately becomes a duty; "one must obey God rather than man."' This thought was probably in the preacher's mind much more often than on his lips. It has given the title to this volume of his sermons, *First Commandment,* 'Thou shalt have no other God but me.' It is possible to protest against the worship of race and nationality in modern Germany and against its barbarities, in the names of reason, and of humanity and of Christ. This protest in the name of Christ is specially bold and weighty, because it comes from inside Germany.

J. K. Nettlefold.

AN AUTO-BIOGRAPHICAL OMNIBUS*

Inside Out consists of extracts from 410 autobiographies translated into English out of six languages. Its author describes it as

> 'a book about life, as seen by some of those who have recorded their experiences of it: some exceptional people, some typical: everyone speaking for multitudes of others.'

For the student of human nature this book is a feast of good things. It is divided into sections analysing the influences that have been brought to bear on the writers during childhood, adolescence and adulthood — the influences of parents, nurses and home: of teachers and schools: of friends, places, books and music: of intimacy with the world of nature whether the countryside or the ocean: of birds, animals and fishes: the awakenings of the mind to the thought of God. Mr. Stuart Bates illustrates his themes by quotations from the writings of such men and women as Axel Munthe, Strindberg (both 'abnormal' children), Gorki, Anatole France, Walter Pater, George Sturt (who 'does not seem to have any recollections of any unpleasant people'), Pierre Loti, André Gide, Albert Schweitzer, Marcel Proust, Carl Spitteler (whose autobiography is unique 'inasmuch as it ends

* *Inside Out, an Introduction to Autobiography.* By E. Stuart Bates. Two vols. (Published by Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 1937. 21/- net each volume.)

with its author's fourth year'), Jane E. Harrison, Ed. Carpenter, Thomas Traherne, Mark Twain ('one of the most disappointing of all personal records), Count Felix von Luckner, W. B. Yeats, Kagawa (who says that when a revolution is hopeless it is best to start a religious movement), Canon J. M. Wilson (of whom the Bishop of Bristol said when appointing a Commission, that it must consist of 'five clergymen, five laymen and Wilson'), Tagore, R. L. Stevenson, C. E. Raven (whose book Mr. Bates calls a 'rather breathless sermon' and who has 'three devotions: to his wife, to his religious ideal, and to natural history'), Freud, John Drinkwater, Siegfried Sassoon, Thomas Okey, Sir James Frazer, Leslie Stephen, Max Müller ('a great admirer' all his life), Mark Pattison (who has 'no history but a mental hisory'), Albert Houtin (for whom Newman's Gram-'mar of Assent acted as 'a disintegrating influence.' To Houtin we owe the verdict on human life: 'Man is only great in proportion to his dreams. He creates the ideal: and in return the ideal creates the man'[1]), Soren Kierkegarrd (to whom Christianity was an organized sense of sin. He longed for a God who should be on his side against his sins instead of on the side of his sins against him), W. E. Orchard (whose wife remarked 'that his difficulty in life consisted in Rome seeming to him a recurring decimal and Nonconformity the vulgar fractions' whose 'search for knowledge is simply a search for authority . . . The question of what is true and what is not never really arises'), Joseph Wright, the greatest of English philologists (who abandoned school mastering 'because he would never be able to put up with the parents'), Croce (who wrote 'one of the unpleasantest of autobiographies'), Count Hermann Keyserling (who brought himself up on Houston Chamberlain and, like Croce, wrote 'one of the unpleasantest of autobiographies'), Richard Baxter (who told Oliver Cromwell 'we took our ancient monarchy to be a blessing, and not an evil to the land'), Alfred Loisy (whom a friend called 'a perpendicular personality'), and Robert Bridges, who tells of his life in verse:

> 'For a happier lot
> Than God giveth me
> It never hath been
> Nor ever shall be.'

Not the least valuable characteristics of this remarkable collection is the author's classification and analysis of the sources of influence on human lives. First in importance come human relationships. Of most great men it has been said that they possessed only one parent — a mother. This dictum receives support from data presented by Mr. Stuart Bates. His descriptions of maternal influence are arresting — that of W. H. Hudson may be cited:

> 'The relations between mother and son were silent ones, but of a silence based on mutual understanding, on the same sensitiveness and

[1] An epigram undoubtedly suggested by Renan's reflection: 'Man is by nature mediocre; he is good for something only when he dreams.'

harmony of feeling about deeper matters: and receiving a permanence beyond death by reason of the gentleness and non-insistence in all that went before. He was the nearest of her children to her in his intimacy with Nature, and this to such an extent that everything beautiful in sight and sound came to him associated with her in his mind' (Vol. I, p. 22).

St. Paul, in writing to Timothy, refers not only to the influence of his mother but to that of his grandmother as moulding his religious character — 'the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice.' *Inside Out* provides some most interesting examples of the influences of grandmothers on their grand-children — pre-eminently in the case of Gorki and Tagore. Gorki writes of his grandmother:

'Married at 18, and losing her first fifteen children in babyhood, she acted as doctor, midwife, adviser and peacemaker to all her neighbours.'

'Everything about her was dark, but within she was luminous with an inextinguishable joyful and ardent flame, which revealed itself in her eyes. Although she was bent, almost hump-backed, in fact, she moved lightly and softly, for all the world like a huge cat. Until she came into my life I seemed to have been asleep and hidden away in obscurity: but when she appeared she woke me and led me to the light of day. Connecting all my impressions by a single thread, she wove them into a pattern of many colours, thus making herself my friend for life, the being nearest my heart, the dearest and best-known of all; while her disinterested love for all creation enriched me, and built up the strength needful for a hard life . . . "Lord, Lord, how good everything is. Don't you see how good everything is?" This was the watchword of her whole life . . . When I thought of Grandmother, all that I found so bad and repulsive in life seemed to leave me, everything was transformed and became more interesting, pleasanter, people seemed to be better and nicer altogether.'

But grandfathers seem to have an influence also, although not so great as that of grandmothers. John Drinkwater wrote of his grandfather:

'My refuge, in these and all other anxieties, was my grandfather. I did not tell him actually of particular troubles, but to be with him was soothing. Also, he liked doing the things that I liked, and he talked to me about serious matters, sometimes in a way that I did not understand, but always in a way that interested me' (Vol. II, p. 202).

But it is of their mothers' influence these men authors chiefly speak. Of their fathers there is very little except in the case of Richard Baxter, whose father was the only personal influence that seems to have accounted for anything. One would perhaps expect the women authors to speak of the influence of their fathers. But it is not so. Compared with those of men there do not seem to be many autobiographies by women. Evidently they have been content to find self-expression in their sons or in their hus-

bands. Curiously enough the autobiographies of women in this volume do not record parental influence, with the exception of a general reference to the kind of home in which they were brought up. Their experience of life begins with themselves except where Mother Nature has cast her spell. Nature seems to have influenced supremely those whose homes were in the English countryside or on the sea coasts of Western Ireland.

The varieties of homes are too many to be described here, but in two cases the beauty of home life is depicted in the serenity and friendship of the parents. The first of these is that of an English Vicarage (Vol. I, p. 57 *f*), the second that of a cultured Japanese home characterized by habitual sweetness of thinking and acting (Vol. I, p. 77).

Schools and schoolmasters play a lesser part than we should have supposed in determining the future of their pupils unless it be that pupils are as a class very ungrateful for the laborious services of their teachers. Mr. Stuart Bates notes that

> 'A special feature of autobiographers is that practically every one of them who has been to school has been to a different school from that of any of the others. Another characteristic almost as invariable is the rarity of finding one who has a good word to say for his school. Equally rare is it to find one who endorses the current notions that Education is what goes on in schools, and that what goes on in schools is Education.'

Several notable exceptions are cited. Curiously enough, considering the severity of German discipline, the pleasantest account of a school in these volumes is that of Pforte as described by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. He remembers with especial satisfaction that:

> 'There were frequent intervals between lessons, plenty of games, and one free day a week during which everybody could read what they liked. Masters were there on this day to answer questions and advise, but not to supervise; and it was to that free day and to the spirit which allowed it that the school owed its best qualities, and to which he owed the fact that on leaving school he took away with him not so much the belief that he knew what he did know, but the inclination to learn more.'

We close this most stimulating volume with a deep sense of gratitude to its author. What the author says of the volumes of John Drinkwater may be justly said of his own:

> 'Recollection and meditation are put before us with an insight and a lucidity which, in combination with the personal qualities that render meditation and recollection best worth while, set the volumes ahead of many worthy competitors. Life worth living: thought worth thinking: English worth reading.'

M. E. Major.

THE PREACHER'S THEME *

Dr. Temple is the exception which proves the rule. The rule, in this case, is that all bishops are overworked with administration; the exception lies in the succession of books great and small which flow from the Archbishop's pen and maintain a standard well worthy of his high office. *The Preacher's Theme To-day* consists of four lectures delivered at the College of Preachers in Washington, an institution, the Archbishop observes, 'of which I greatly wish we had the like in the Church of England.' The lectures were the subject of discussion with the hearers, and are 'not to be regarded as a complete statement, even in outline, of the subjects handled.' However, what subjects the Archbishop selected for discussion is a matter of considerable interest. His gifts of exposition are too well known to need comment here.

The first lecture was entitled 'Revelation.' After criticizing Dialectical Materialism, a distinction is drawn between Pantheism and Theism, with the suggestion that according to Pantheism God nowhere takes definite action, while in Theism God is conceived as living and righteous will. 'God,' in Arthur Balfour's phrase, 'takes sides.' 'Unless,' the Archbishop says, 'all things are revelation, nothing can be revelation,' but some events 'will represent Him more fully than others.' Human character is clearest revealed in emergency, and the analogy is applicable. Sin is the chief occasion for the divine revelation, and that is what the Bible presents to us. The *locus* of the revelation is not in the mind but in the event, of which the significance is not exhausted by any one interpretation of it. The subject matter of revelation, his argument proceeds, is God and the Church. In the Old Testament 'the servant of Jehovah is contracted, so to speak, from the whole community to the Remnant, and from the Remnant to a single individual,' but thenceforth it is reconstituted and goes forth into the world as the Christian Church. It seems possible the modern preacher will have to deal more with two points on which the Archbishop does not enlarge. By what criteria are we to judge one event more revealing of God than another? And what is the relation between the true Israel of God and the present organized Churches? May a contraction, as in the time of the Remnant, again have taken place?

The second lecture is on the Incarnation. While the event is primary it will not bring forth its spiritual fruit unless there are hearts and minds sufficiently enlightened to appreciate it. His Grace properly criticizes views of the Incarnation which he regards as inadequate. He appears to be referring to Liberal or Modern Churchmen in the following paragraph:

> 'They say that the Divine Spirit is manifest in all the world, which is true, and that He is supremely manifest in the character set before us in the Gospel, which is also true. Therefore, we have learned from this figure of the Gospel what is the character of God. We confess the

* *The Preacher's Theme To-day.* By the Archbishop of York. (S.P.C.K. 2/6. pp. 86.)

divinity of Christ, but need not commit ourselves to His Deity. That is a distinction which, in England, has been emphasized rather strongly of late in some theological quarters, and one section of opinion calling itself orthodox and continuing to use the Nicene Creed to express itself is, in fact, in very close harmony with one section of Unitarian thought which accepts our Lord as the supreme and sufficient manifestation of divine character.

'It seems to me there are two fatal objections to that view. The first is that it affords no ground for answering the question how you are to be assured in your belief that this figure discloses the character of the eternal God' (p. 28).

Surely this objection begs the question, and the precise claim of liberal theology is that its account of the Incarnation along the lines of the activity of the Spirit of God does give intelligible, coherent and, in the sphere of experience, a verifiable account of God, Christ, and the world. The reviewer is not competent to deal with so profound a metaphysical question. Only it happens to be his experience that his own faith in the Incarnation is, humanly, far more indebted to the writings of liberal theologians such as Rashdall and Streeter than to the perplexing arguments of conservative theologians such as Gore or, with every respect, such as the Archbishop himself. The Archbishop's second fatal objection is even more surprising. Dr. Temple writes:

'If God is indeed such love as is depicted in that story, then He must have taken on Himself the sin and suffering of the world. And if there is no ground for supposing that He has actually done this, then the God who is supposed to be revealed is inferior to the image which is supposed to reveal Him. Christ is greater than God unless God Himself is in Christ actually and factually.'

True, and again true. But who is the Archbishop 'getting at'? Not Modern Churchmen, or I have misunderstood all my teachers. I have often used the phrase 'supremely manifest,' but it has never occurred to me that this was denying God's presence and activity in Christ. Manifestation is activity.

There follows after these sections the references, one must perforce describe as usual, to the value of intellectual humility and of dogma; one awaits patiently the reference to one's fervent and enormously helpful belief that Christ was 'only a man' or 'a mere man.' It comes in the following words with reference to our fellowship with our Master:

'That kind of fellowship with Him would be a thing entirely incredible if He were only a human being like other human beings through whom, in a special manner, the Spirit of God spoke and acted.'

If the Archbishop here would omit 'only,' which is meaningless; and omit 'like other human beings,' which begs all questions; and would change 'spoke and acted' into 'speaks and acts,' which would be fairer than a past tense, then perhaps he could omit 'incredible' as well. Nor in the original sentence is the apparently minimizing reference to the Spirit of God altogether attractive.

To cavil thus at a few paragraphs of the Archbishop's book may seem out of proportion, but the justification is in two facts. First, Dr. Temple with his deep and broad grasp of traditional theology is a writer peculiarly helpful to those who judge themselves called to a greater adventure of mind, and it is merely confusing when the Archiepiscopal barrage falls into his own front line as well as into the enemy's. Second, such passages as these, with his considerable authority behind them, do add another stone to that formidable barrier of distrust which the mass of conservative clergy and laity erect against their liberal brethren; thus both truth and fellowship are hindered.

The third lecture is on Sin and Atonement. Discarding superficial analyses, Dr. Temple says that self-centredness is sin. Selfhood is the basis of all spiritual good and of all spiritual evil. The seat of sin is in the spiritual life itself. Man cannot reconstruct himself for he does not want to. What does control conduct by means of, and not by overriding, freedom? One thing only — the sacrifice of love. We are drawn out of our self-centredness by the Cross. If I understand the Archbishop's argument aright, it is the suffering of Christ on the Cross which makes the forgiveness of God righteous. We make the fruit of that act our own by faith, both in the sense of intellectual acceptance and of personal trust.

His last lecture is entitled 'Christianity, Ethics, and Politics.' It is more discursive than the other chapters and reflects the problems which beset the practical administrator. Much of the chapter is given to a discussion of marriage and pleads for, and gives a good example of, a realistic treatment of the subject. The Archbishop admits that re-marriage is not *always* wrong, and pictures a person coming to him with the humble conviction that his first marriage had been a mistake but the new one would be 'right in the sight of God'; to him the Archbishop would say, 'The Church cannot approve that; but this is not necessarily to condemn it.' Apparently he might have to answer in a moment of frankness, 'You believe you are doing the will of God; I too believe it; but as a minister of God I will not be party to carrying out God's will.' This is a position some ministers of God might find intolerable; at the least we must ask by what authority the Church presumes thus to forbid the doing of God's will. The Archbishop's argument would seem to emphasize the Church's duty to make unambiguous witness to a general principle. Some will feel it is more important to bear unambiguous witness to the sanctity of conscience, including the clergy's, and that sufficient witness is borne to this particular principle of life-long marriage by the formulas, the liturgies, and the preaching of the Church. Dr. Temple makes a fine plea for charity in discipline, but the prior question is the propriety of the discipline and the fundamental witness to the sanctity of a man's conscience, especially in a matter so personal and intimate. Too much is made to-day of the danger to public morality by increasing divorces. In 1934 the number of divorces in Great Britain was 4,755; the number of marriages that year was 395,095.

This makes a divorces-to-marriages rate of 1·2 per cent. This hardly suggests the institution of marriage is being undermined; indeed, to some it may seem surprisingly low for this wicked world. At any rate, the preoccupation of ecclesiastical assemblies with the problem shows a doubtful sense of proportion. It were better to attend more to subjects such as unemployment, on which Dr. Temple says many interesting and helpful things in this last lecture. Much that he here says can bear to be repeated many times to Christian people, not least on the power and place of sacrifice in the economic sphere. H. G. MULLINER.

THE SAINT OF 'HOLY INDIFFERENCE'*

In his short study of St. Francis de Sales, Dr. Müller reveals the human beauty of character and the human qualities of understanding and sympathy peculiar to one of the most lovable and sane of saints.

Never, perhaps, were two saints of the same name: St. Francis de Sales and St. Francis of Assisi — further opposed to their outward circumstances. Though both were born to a life of wealth and luxury, the more famous saint of Assisi renounced all earthly possessions, took Poverty for his bride, and chose to live as a beggar among beggars. St. Francis de Sales, son of a Swiss noble and heir to all his estates, though he renounced the life of a great landowner and, much against his father's will, entered the Church, yet never wholly relinquished a life of external comfort, for he became Bishop of Geneva, and held throughout his life a high position in the Church and among the theological scholars of the day. This knowledge of the circumstances of his life adds value to his teaching; he lived in the world, knew and understood the worldly life, and preached the possibility of holiness while living in the world. It was not necessary to retreat to the seclusion and peace of the cloister in order to live the saintly life. Knowing

> 'the superficial life in the courts of princes, and the dangers of the world . . . ' (p. 229)

he also knew that

> 'if the soul is tightly anchored in God there are no fears of the storms of life . . . Thus St. Francis makes no effort to withdraw the souls entrusted to him from court life, or from the world . . . He is convinced that the greater the external danger, the greater the interior support of God ' (p. 221).

His was the robust faith that fears no secular perils.

Much of his doctrine, especially with regard to asceticism, obedience and fasting, is modern in the best sense of the word, certainly such a delightful dictum as: 'Less rigour for the body; more gentleness of heart,' and he fully understood the only perfect form of sublimation:

> 'The white heat of love of God will dissolve the red heat of sinful lust. Let us conform human desire with God's will, and it no longer needs a strong rein ' (p. 219).

* *Saint Francis de Sales.* By Michael Müeller. (Sheed and Ward. 1936. 6/-.)

Here is the ideal of the true saint, far removed from the scourgings and fierce bodily punishments of many of the ascetics, in whose pitiless self-chastisements one cannot help suspecting a pathological origin. St. Francis de Sales was a man of health as well as of holiness, who knew that the soul filled entirely with the love of God must attain to perfect health as a result of the healing beauty of the inner flame.

The language of spiritual truth is inevitably the language of paradox, and never is this more clearly evidenced than in the doctrines of human and divine love, and of 'holy indifference.' The life and teaching of St. Francis does much to clarify these obscurities. The certainty of divine love as the centre, human relationships all inevitably radiating from that centre, was at the very heart of his beliefs, and in his own relationships with Madame de Chantal (St. Jean-Francis de Chantal) there is a living evidence of the possibility of perfection in that most delicate and difficult of situations, a loving friendship between a man and a woman. But since

> 'from the very first moment the only question they asked was — what is God's will, and this holy friendship began through love of God' (p. 153).

there could be no doubt as to the issue. Yet for many months Francis wrestled with the problems involved:

> 'in strictest self-examination and in supplication to God for clarity and truth. Neither her wish nor his own inclination was to affect him — but only God's will. At last he reached that height where all earthly considerations fade: his own will was silent and God alone was there in overwhelming force' (p. 19).

As for her: 'from the very beginning and from the depths of my heart,' she said, 'I called him a saint' and the friendship became for them both 'a source of strength for eternal life,' and for the world a glorious living realization of an ideal.

St. Francis continually clarifies the problem of human and divine love, relating how the heart must free itself from all creatures in order to love God completely, returning later to that same human love, yet with a supreme difference, loving God's creatures through love of God, as His creations, seeing God revealed in and through them, no longer

> 'loving because the earthly ego hankers and then enjoys selfish satisfaction, but rather for the will of the most beloved Father in Heaven Who has created all these good things and now wills that His child should have joy in them' (p. 176).

The great poem, 'The Hound of Heaven,' written by another Francis, who shared many of the saint's attributes, is from this point of view incomplete, since it speaks only of the soul's surrender to God, the casting-off of all earthly ties and loves, saying nothing of the vitally important return to human life. St. Francis de Sales says: 'The soul cast off all its inclinations and stood naked before God.' Francis Thompson's imagery is almost identical: 'Naked I wait Thy Love's stroke,' and the poem ends

on the note: 'Rise, clasp My hand, and come!' but St. Francis goes further when he says:

> 'I believe that all, with the exception of God, is nothing to me any longer: but in Him and for Him I love more tenderly than ever what I love . . . What joy to love without fear of exaggeration! There is never the least to fear when one loves in God' (p. 176).

This is far, as Dr. Müller points out, from the attitude of the cold ascetics who misunderstood and dishonoured the glory of human love.

> 'It is certainly not the meaning of religion to try and crush the noble inclinations given us by God, but rather to sanctify them through identifying them with the love of God and thus bringing them to completion' (p. 177).

He knew that Jesus's love for man was full of human warmth; deep, even passionate. It was natural for Jesus to suffer at the death of Lazarus, his friend. So St. Francis at the death-bed of his mother was not ashamed to weep, as St. Augustine had been, because his tears were 'without spiritual bitterness.' He disliked the unnatural hardening of the heart to sorrow which is found in many saints, knowing that human suffering, rightly understood and accepted, is redemptive, and therefore sanctified.

The doctrine of 'holy indifference,' summed up in St. Paul's words: 'Be careful for nothing,' and one fraught with difficulties for many Christians, is as lucidly explained as any spiritual truth can ever be. The soul dedicated to God, used by God as His instrument, cannot have care for the passing things of the world, although reasonable attention to the concerns of daily living is of course necessary. But 'care' in this context means anxiety, and anxiety means lack of faith, disbelief in Jesus's assurance that 'your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.' Faith and anxiety cannot live together; either trust in God is absolute, casting out fear, or fear is in possession, belying belief. And concentration on the love of God inevitably means little interest in the things that distract from it.

> 'Logically, therefore, Francis puts the duty of indifference beside the necessity for concentration. He praises "sainte indifference" tirelessly, saying that it alone guarantees that "spirit of the beloved children of God" who, fearlessly and in any circumstances, "follow the known will of God." . . . "Life and death, all our relations, we should leave purely and simply to Divine Providence." Holy indifference should exist with regard to unavoidable changes of mood—changes from joy and inspiration to depression and exhaustion, because "why should it worry us if we wander through deserts if only God is with us?"' (pp. 150—152).

And St. Francis was probably the greatest of Christian psychologists. 'Let us be completely what we are,' he says. Self-knowledge is the first essential, recognition of the individual ideal the second, and the perfect Christian joyfully affirms his personality as it was created by God, joyfully recognizes the truth that each individual has a certain work to do for God which can be done by no one else.

> 'The holy man is also the healthy man, and the complete Christian is the complete personality' (p. 108).

Dr. Müller's book should prove a powerful incentive to a study of the life and writings of a man who besides being a saint must have been a delightful human being.

DALLAS KENMARE.

A PLAIN MAN'S GUIDE TO CHRISTIANITY*

To an intelligent observer it has been abundantly clear for some time past that there are now three types of Anglo-Catholicism existing within the borders of the Anglican Communion. The first type is that which may be called the Traditionalist and which is a true child of the Tractarian movement. The men of this school take their stand upon the Prayer Book and are, for the most part, willing to accept most of the established results of historical criticism so long as they stop short at the creeds. It is this type with which we are most familiar and which is undoubtedly still the most influential. Secondly, there is a party which claims to have the allegiance of over three thousand clergy and which, partly from fear of modernism and partly because of the apparent hopelessness of the task of latinizing the Church of England, is disposed to accept the whole of the Papal claims and is indeed now working to bring about our submission to the Holy See. Thirdly, there is a definitely liberal type of Anglo-Catholicism. Members of this school accept without reserve all the methods of historical criticism and

> 'are finding under the inspiration of a liberal outlook that Catholicism and Evangelicalism are not really alternative and incompatible forms of the Christian religion, but that they are complementary to one another and, at their best, indispensable to one another.'

The Rev. A. R. Vidler's *A Plain Man's Guide to Christianity* from which we have quoted above is one of the most useful little books we have seen for some time. The 'plain man' of whom we hear so much and see so little is a very elusive individual, but it is clear that Mr. Vidler's 'plain man' is an Anglo-Catholic and probably an altar server or an acolyte. Nevertheless, this hypothetical individual is clearly one who is conscious of all the difficulties for faith in the modern world, and in this book he will find his religion restated for him in an intelligible and, for the most part, simple manner. The volume covers a wide field under the four headings of 'Belief in God, Belief in Christ, The Church and the Means of Grace, Last Things.' The author subjoins as an alternative title 'Essays in Liberal Catholicism,' and, although less attractive, this might have been a more accurate title for the book.

Mr. Vidler's first section, in which he deals with 'Belief in God,' is wholly admirable in its simplicity and conciseness. We are all aware of the attacks that have been made upon religion by pseudo-psychologists. Reli-

* *A Plain Man's Guide to Christianity*. By Alec R. Vidler, O.G.S. (Heinemann. 5/-.)

gious experience is airily dismissed as illusion, and similarly the idea of God is dismissed as a 'projection.' The author points out that:

> 'No experience, whether religious or of any other kind, can always be taken at its face value. It has to be tested and verified, it has to be scrutinised and interpreted. But it is quite irrational to single out religious experience, and to say that it alone is entirely untrustworthy and unreal because it is mixed up with superstition. At that rate all our experience would have to go by the board. The worst of sceptics is that they are not sceptical enough' (p. 18).

It is unfortunately true too that the psychologist is often far too prone to step outside his own province, and to pass judgments on the mental processes which form the subject of his investigations which should properly be made by the philosopher. Again, as Mr. Vidler, following Dean Matthews, indicates, nobody worries about the idea of God being a projection so long as it is not maintained that it is only a projection and nothing more. It is unquestionably true, however, that in the last resort:

> 'Belief about God or indeed anything is found to be fully convincing in proportion as it is tested and verified in personal experience' (p. 49).

We have often heard that the quest for the historical Jesus of the last decade resulted only in the seeker being confronted with his own reflection — the face of a nineteenth-century Liberal Protestant gazing up from the bottom of a deep well. On the other hand, the Roman Modernists like Loisy and Tyrrell tended to divorce Christianity from history, and then, as Dr. Inge pointed out in his famous Oxford University sermon of 1904, to identify the Christ of the Catholic Church with the Catholic Church itself. Mr. Vidler declares that:

> 'The historical evidence on which the doctrine of the Incarnation depends is the whole volume of Christian experience which is spread over history and which is being continued and extended to-day' (p. 80).

In connection with the bearing of the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and physical resurrection on the doctrine of the Incarnation he says:

> 'The doctrine of the Incarnation is to be regarded as an explanation of the facts of Christian experience as a whole, and its truth is to be judged in relation to those facts as a whole. There is no need to claim infallibility for any single detail in the formulation of the doctrine; its basis in experience is so vast that we can regard with equanimity the possibility that some of its implications, as they have been traditionally formulated, may have to be modified, abandoned or interpreted as symbolically rather than factually true' (p. 81).

Since Mr. Vidler is convinced that 'the core of the Christian creed' is that Jesus was 'crucified under Pontius Pilate,' we have here a view of the Incarnation which so far from setting the Jesus of history in opposition to the Christ of faith sees them as complementary, one being inadequate without the other. Such a view is not without its dangers, as is seen later on in the book, where, in speaking of the Eucharist and the sacramental system of the Church, the author says:

'. . . the Church is guided and inspired by the Spirit of God. Whether this or that detail in its religious system can be traced back to the explicit teaching of Jesus during His earthly ministry is a secondary question. For what Jesus did not say on earth, He may have said from heaven, *i.e.* under the guiding influence of His Spirit' (p. 159).

Yet a few pages previously Mr. Vidler waves to one side the question as to whether or not Jesus founded the Church:

'It is anyhow a fact that His earthly ministry and particularly the events in which it culminated issued in the constitution of the Church' (p. 152).

In view of this statement and its implied admission, we do not think that the author would claim infallibility for the Catholic Church, and consequently so far from being 'a secondary question' it is a primary question whether, for instance, the Eucharist can be traced back to the Jesus of history. If the answer be in the negative, then we might proceed to justify its retention because of 'its proved spiritual value.' If we are to be guided primarily by what Jesus may have said from heaven we shall soon find ourselves living in a kind of ecclesiastical nightmare. Again, although doubtless many will agree with Mr. Vidler that

'the question is not so much one of origin as of proved spiritual value' (p. 159).

This is no doubt very true, but the 'plain man' whom the author has in mind, if he is a typical Englishman, will primarily be keenly interested to know the origin of any particular rite in which he is asked to take part. Its authority in his eyes will be infinitely greater if it can be shown that that rite owes its institution to the Jesus of the New Testament. If the attempt fails, then one would proceed to justify the rite in his eyes because of its value in experience. Our disagreement here with Mr. Vidler is on a matter of approach.

Of the creeds the author has some thoughtful things to say. He is aware of their difficulties and also of the various alternative formulations that have been put forward, but he does not incline towards any of them. So far from regarding the present creeds as excluding documents, he looks upon them as bulwarks of liberalism:

'From a genuinely liberal point of view, the ancient creeds, just because, while expressing the historic faith of the Church they do not admit of strict and literal interpretation, recommend themselves very strongly for present use' (p. 176).

Mr. Vidler inclines to the view, however, that the creeds take too prominent a part in our services and that their use might well be considerably reduced. We can almost see a twinkle in his eye when he writes:

'This is, in fact, being done; for instance, in many Anglican Churches, though curiously enough not in those which are most associated with vocal objections to the use of our existing creeds, the Nicene creed is omitted in the Communion service on most days in the year' (p. 177).

The author has a lucid style of writing, and although the 'plain man'

will occasionally find himself in difficulty, on the whole, he will find himself dealt with in an easy and understanding manner. The following is an illustration of how he will find theological abstractions simplified:

> '. . . the best analogy of how grace works will not be the pouring of medicine into our bodies, but the personal influence which is exercised upon us by our friends' (p. 182).

We are not surprised that the Bishop of Bristol has commended this book to the clergy of his diocese. The book is characterized by common sense and breadth of outlook. It shows clearly the influence of writers like George Tyrrell, which is not surprising when we recall that it was not so very long ago that the author gave us his *Modernist Movement in the Roman Church*. The author has certainly indicated a new line of approach, but while we have unquestionably much to learn from the movement on which he is an authority we must avoid its minimizing of the value of history, which the author of this book does not altogether avoid. Nevertheless, we rejoice at the appearance of yet another indication of a 'new spirit in Anglo-Catholicism.' Again and again the religious liberal of whatever ecclesiastical school will find here in this book what he has hitherto felt but has never been able to articulate. In view of the political agitations on the part of some of the clergy it is not without interest to find the author saying:

> 'Since the Great War it has become plain to many, though not of course to all, that the Labour Party is not in practice much more qualified than either of the older political parties to initiate immediately the construction of a Christian social order' (p. 210).

W. J. CRATCHLEY.

THE LAYMAN'S BOOK OF THE GOSPELS*

Here at last is Everyman's — and especially every schoolboy's — guide to the Gospels. This book steers a safe course between the Scylla of what it terms the 'obscurantism and lack of discernment' of the old popular commentaries and the Charybdis of the confusing technicalities and hypercritical speculations of those modern scholars who, like the man with the muck rake in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, 'gather the dust and the small straws of the floor.' The authors realise that the elder generation of Gospel critics were perhaps 'too much at ease in Sion,' and are themselves anxious not to shirk any real difficulties. But to points that are barren and merely academic the sharp edge of Occam's razor is relentlessly applied. Here is a commentary that is eminently readable, practical and to the point.

The material has been divided into three Books. Book I, by Dr. Major, deals with *Incidents in the Life of Jesus*, and comprises the entire text of the Second Gospel, followed by such incidents as are recorded exclusively in the First and Third Gospels.

* *The Message and Mission of Jesus.* An Exposition of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Research. By H. D. A. Major, T. W. Manson and C. J. Wright. (Ivor Nicholson and Watson. 1937. Price 25/- net.)

In the Second Book Professor Manson comments on the *Sayings of Jesus,* as recorded in the document 'Q' (common to Mt. and Lk.) and the teaching peculiar to Mt. (='M'), and finally that which is only to be found in Luke (='L'). Occasionally these three sources overlap, and it is often hard to differentiate between them, but this method of printing and treating them separately serves to bring out the differences of style and outlook, and Prof. Manson more than justifies his method.

Sometimes the same material is printed and commented on in both Books I and II. For instance, the Temptation Narratives of Mt. and Lk. are also printed by Dr. Major on the same page (26) as the brief account in St. Mark. The text used is the Revised Version, and it is noticeable that whereas Prof. Manson includes the important Marginal Readings, Dr. Major and Dr. Wright do not.

Professor Wright's share of the commentary, in Book III, is called *Jesus: the Revelation of God,* and is devoted to the Fourth Gospel. Here no attempt is made, as might well have been the case, to separate the narrative from the discourses. But the Gospel is divided into two parts and an epilogue (Chapter XXI), the first (Chapters I—XII) entitled 'The Witness of Jesus and the Conflict it occasions,' and the second (Chapters XIII—XX) wholly concerned with the events and sayings of the Passion.

To each of the three Books is prefixed an Introduction. Dr. Major, besides a scholarly survey of the external evidence as to the genesis of the synoptic narratives, also contributes a general introduction to the whole volume. In asking the question 'Are the Gospels true history?' he convincingly dismisses the *'Christ-Myth' School* (now lingering only in the writings of Couchoud and in the publications of the Rationalist Press) and the *Eschatological School* of Schweitzer, and substitutes a far more convincing picture of what was involved in the Crucifixion. Where he is perhaps not quite so persuasive is in his treatment of the *'Form Criticism' School.* The statement (p. xxi) that 'the beads (*i.e.* the separate paragraphs of the oral tradition) are for the form-critics the creation of the primitive Christian teachers and missionaries . . . to satisfy the curiosity and devotional and practical needs of . . . the primitive Christian communities . . . and to meet their apologetic needs in their work of propaganda' is true enough as a description of some extremist theories such as Bultmann's; but it surely ignores the far more moderate conclusions of 'form-critics' such as Albertz or Vincent Taylor, with whom Dr. Major goes on to show himself to be substantially in agreement.

Amongst these must be numbered Prof. Manson. Taking up the work of Burney, who claimed that most of the teaching was originally couched in the rhythms of Aramaic verse and actually made use of *rhyme,* he is at pains to point out the elaborate parallelisms to be found in many passages of Q. But he also finds a definite form and unity in Q itself — as it stands in his reconstruction. There are even four points where the order of the material in M corresponds with the arrangement of the Q material *in St.*

Luke's order, and this suggests (p. 314) that 'there is a scheme of the teaching older than M and Q.' He suggests (pp. 308-312) that Q (which may well have contained no narrative at all) comprises 'the Oracles which (as Papias tells us) Matthew wrote down in the Hebrew tongue: and each one translated them as he was able'; and that it was used, possibly at Antioch, as a book of instruction for converts before A.D. 50. With regard to M, he concludes (p. 318) that it 'is a source to be used with great caution. Doubtless it preserves much authentic teaching of Jesus: but there are good grounds for suspecting that there has been a considerable amount of adulteration from the Jewish side and from the teaching of John the Baptist.' The sentence 'It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one tittle of the law to fall,' which in Q (*Lk.* xvi, 17) is an ironical comment on 'the obstinate conservatism of the scribes,' is taken seriously by the compiler of 'M.' The latter's extreme respect for the law, coupled with a violent antagonism to the lawyers, suggests the church at Jerusalem about A.D. 65 as its most likely provenance. L, which is much more disjointed, was probably first collected by Luke himself at Caesarea in A.D. 60.

Professor Wright concludes with a penetrating analysis—what he calls a 'psychological exegesis'—of the thought of the Fourth Gospel. It is not 'precise,' but it *is* 'essential,' biography. It records *the substance of the thought* of Jesus, *what He knew Himself to be in the depth of His mind,* often in the language of *'oratio recta.'* 'Jesus was least misunderstood by the Johannine seer.' Dr. Wright tends to minimize the influence of Hellenistic thought on the Evangelist, but he will not allow that the author was the son of Zebedee. He assumes rather lightly that the latter *was* the Beloved Disciple (who may surely have been some young member of the seventy as well as the author of the Gospel and John of Ephesus—which possibilities are scarcely mentioned) and he puts rather too much weight upon a conjectural interpretation of the anti-Marcionite Prologue (p. 658). It is in his explanation of the text of the Gospel that he comes near to Professor Manson's achievement of enlarging as well as summarising the confines of our knowledge. Particularly attractive is his suggestion that the omission of any reference to eating (except, significantly, by Judas) at the Last Supper was to recall the Church of the day from the magical emphasis of the mystery cults to 'the spiritual inner meaning of the words and acts of Jesus on that solemn occasion' (p. 694); and that the Evangelist in omitting the misunderstood Apocalyptic of Mk. is 'returning to the essential mood and spiritual emphasis of Jesus Himself.' Like Professor Dodd, Dr. Wright says that the Judgment of Jesus is eternal, not temporal. Many will doubt the probability that the evangelist had read Matthew (p. 648), and others will miss (p. 918) a reference to Juster's evidence that the Jews were allowed by the Romans to inflict capital punishment. And surely Dr. Manson might have included a reference (p. 583) to Torrey's suggestive interpretation of the Parable of the Unjust Steward.

One might point to other omissions. But with a volume so richly packed, that would seem ungrateful. At any rate, no one will regret the space given to many a felicitous quotation from the English poets, and the useful Table of Contents, Bibliographies and Indices. And the whole work is marked by an erudition that is never pedantic, and by an outlook that is at once critical and constructive, reverent and sane. The absence of Greek and Hebrew lettering should render the book serviceable to a very wide public, while even the expert will find that this book will have something to teach him. H. P. KINGDON.

SEX AND YOUTH*

This small book of 150 pages may be heartily recommended to any young man or woman who wishes to get a sane and generally comprehensive view of the various problems of sex and the meaning of marriage. It is short and easy to read. Sex, it says, is everyone's personal problem; here is where we live. From sex troubles, perhaps, more men and women are suffering than from all economic causes combined. The tragedies of sex are writ large in history and in the scriptures of religion. Man alone of animals is ashamed of sex. Why? . . . After a stimulating introduction, we read chapters on sex education, problems of youth, autoerotism, the choice of a life companion, marriage and family limitation. At the end some of the burning questions of the day are faced. The facts and figures given are American, but these, if we allow for national differences, reflect the same national tendencies here in Britain. In the matter of family limitation, the author seems still to fear over-population; he does not seem awake to the decline of population which is imminent both here and in America: but the real problem to-day is not so much concerned with quantity as with quality of population; this point is duly emphasized. 'There is no greater curse,' he says, 'to posterity, than of bequeathing them an increasing population of imbeciles.' The book is written from a sane religious standpoint, and if it were grasped by some of our ecclesiastical traditionalists, we should make a more rapid approach to a moral reformation. The change from Victorian prudery to naked realism has been too rapid for our human adaptation; it is to be hoped that civilized humanity will shortly reach a period of reasoned stability, with a new and comprehensive philosophy of sex. D.W.

TO THE HEART OF THE PEOPLE†

Many who listen in on Thursday nights to the mid-week talks given by the Rev. W. H. Elliott will be glad to have them in a more permanent form. These addresses are models of what preaching should be in our parish churches. The addresses are simple, sincere and short: but they are more than that: they treat without exaggeration and without rhetoric the temptations and perplexities of ordinary human experience and their treatment is sympathetic and practical — sometimes perhaps, sentimental. And many people really like sentiment, although they would scorn to confess that they do. Some sermons we listen to irritate us. Others raise far more doubts and difficulties than they solve, but taken as a whole, Mr. Elliott's

* *Sex and Youth.* By Dr. Sherwood Eddy. Popular Edition. (Student Christian Movement Press. 1/- net.)

† *Mid-Week Talks.* By W. H. Elliott. (Mowbray's. 1936. 2/-.)

sermons 'ease the situation,' and that we believe is one reason why hundreds of thousands of people are glad to listen to him week by week. Some may think that there is nothing easier than to compose sermons of this kind, but Mr. Elliott knows otherwise. 'Thoughts that do tenderly touch,' to use the phrase of Sir Thomas Browne, put into a form which comes home to 'Men's business and bosoms,' to use a phrase from Sir Francis Bacon, seem to us to describe Mr. Elliott's addresses. Of them we may use another classical English phrase, this time from Shakespeare:

'nothing ever comes amiss
When simpleness and duty tender it.'

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST.

SIR,

May I be allowed to offer a few remarks on the review of my book, *The Miracles of Christ in the Light of our Present Knowledge,* as it appeared in the May number of the *Modern Churchman*?

In the first place, I fail to see on what grounds I am apparently credited with thinking that the temptations to which our Lord was subjected in the wilderness — and notably that of turning stones into bread — should be interpreted literally. I have expressly said (p. 68), 'It is quite out of the question to regard the accounts given as descriptive of any outwardly occurring series of events,' and again, 'The story' (*i.e.* of the Temptation) 'is His own characteristic way of describing, by use of external imagery, the nature of the dread inward struggle through which His soul had passed.'

I am entirely unrepentant, too, in reference to what I have said about Matthew Arnold's comparison of our Lord's miracles, as reported in the Gospels, to the turning of 'a pen into a pen-wiper.' I stick to it that 'a more inept comparison was never, I think, made by a cultivated writer.' What kind of congruity is there between that, his so flippant a remark, and those special characteristics of the 'miracles' to which I have drawn attention on pages 66-76 and 174-176?

I am not in the least anxious to maintain that every so-called 'miraculous event' happened in exactly the same way as it is described in the Gospels, or that there exists no profound difference between the Synoptic and the Johannine accounts of our Lord's sayings and doings. But that does not do away with the fact, as I have pointed out on p. 77, that in the case of no fewer than six out of the seven specially recorded 'Johannine signs' parallels or closely corresponding narratives are to be found in the earlier Gospels.

If the dogmatism of the extreme traditionalists is to be greatly deplored and deprecated, so also is that of the extreme Modernists, whose bias seems to lie in precisely the opposite direction. It may well be that on many of the highly controversial matters which arise in connection with the New Testament the final word has not by any means yet been spoken, and, likely enough, never will be. And in this may we not perhaps discern a certain Divine intention?

JOHN H. BEST.

15 Moreton Road, Oxford.

Sir,

Dr. Wright's Reply to the Rev. John H. Best.

Let me deal with the points raised by Mr. Best *seriatim*:

1. *The Temptation.* Of the specific 'temptation' to which I referred—*viz.* the turning of stones into bread—Mr. Best in his book says: Jesus 'is never represented as having worked a single miracle on His own behalf. He will turn water into wine, that nothing may mar the gladness of a marriage feast; He will provide an ample meal for the multitude who all day long have been listening to His wonderful teaching; but He will not convert the stones of the wilderness into bread to satisfy His own hunger,' etc. I duly noted, and with interest, the other passages to which Mr. Best refers in his letter. What I would wish him to do is to apply the principle of symbolical interpretation to the *whole* narrative of the Temptation, and not just to the points on which everyone is agreed. Everyone is agreed that Jesus was not taken bodily by a visible devil to a pinnacle of the temple: but not everyone is agreed that Jesus was not 'tempted' to perform 'miracles.' I gather from various passages in his book that Mr. Best *does* think that Jesus was 'tempted' to exercise 'miraculous' power on His own behalf in the wilderness—He would feed a multitude with a few crumbs, but refused to create food for Himself. To my own view, and I speak with desirable precision, the idea that stones could be turned into bread, or any kindred thought, never entered the mind of our Lord. As far as I understand Mr. Best, he wants to use his belief that Jesus was really 'tempted' to perform 'miracles' in the wilderness to buttress the historicity of such incidents as the turning of water into wine, the miraculous feeding of the multitude, etc. The substance of Mr. Best's position, as I understand it, is: The Temptation narrative shows that Jesus was tempted, and refused, to perform 'miracles' *on His own behalf*; and this confirms, or helps to confirm, the historicity of those 'miracles' in the Gospels which Jesus is recorded as performing *on behalf of other people.* If I am wrong as to Mr. Best's meaning, I cannot but think that he will have to rewrite several passages in his book.

2. I am sorry that Mr. Best is unrepentant in reference to his statement about Matthew Arnold's 'inept comparison.' To the best of my knowledge, Matthew Arnold never *compared* our Lord's miracles as reported in the Gospels to the turning of a pen into a penwiper. The kind of use made of this supposed comparison by some apologetic writers makes it difficult to avoid the conclusion that they are quite unacquainted with the precise utterance of Matthew Arnold in its context and quite unacquainted with 'The Proof from Miracles' he was assailing. What Matthew Arnold did say was: 'That miracles, when fully believed, are felt by men in general to be a source of authority, it is absurd to deny. One may say, indeed: Suppose I could change the pen with which I write this into a penwiper, I should not thus make what I write any the truer or more convincing. That may be so in reality, but the mass of mankind feel differently. In the judgment of the mass of mankind, could I visibly and undeniably change the pen with which I write this into a penwiper, not only would this which I write acquire a claim to be held perfectly true and convincing, but I should even be entitled to affirm, and to be believed in affirming, propositions the most palpably at war with common fact and experience,' etc.

3. To discuss 'Johannine signs,' and Mr. Best's references to them, would take an undue amount of your space. My own view of these 'signs,' referred to in my review, I have discussed at considerable length elsewhere.

4. *Dogmatism* is a word of various connotations. If it is taken to mean confident or arrogant assertions on issues where, from the nature of the case, complete certainty is difficult of attainment, I am in hearty agreement with Mr. Best. If, however, it is used to deride the endeavour to state with complete candour what one really thinks — the endeavour after clarity and precision of thought — so far am I from wishing to deride it that I am convinced without it we shall never understand one another and never reach a worthy apologetic of our Christian faith.

Didsbury College, Manchester. C. J. WRIGHT.

INTERNATIONAL LIBERAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE.

SIR,

In November, 1936, you printed an article on 'the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom' (I.A.R.F.), whose office is at Nieume Gracht 27, Utrecht, Holland.

I should like, if I may, to draw the attention of your readers to the fact that this Association will be holding its Twelfth International Congress on 'Liberal Christianity: the World's Need' at Manchester College, Oxford, from August 3rd—8th, while the Junior Branch (the Leiden International Bureau) meets in the same place from July 29th — August 2nd. (Apply to Miss E. Hall.)

So far the bulk of the English members of this Association are Unitarian. That is by no means the case with the Association as a whole, and its Secretariat is very anxious to make contacts with Modernist Trinitarians in England. It is to be hoped that some of your readers will take this opportunity of making these contacts, and seeing for themselves to what extent the claim of the Secretariat is true that the differences between Modernist Trinitarians and Christian Unitarians are largely out-of-date.

Full particulars of the Conference may be obtained from the Rev. J. W. Cock, 2 Lonsdale Road, Oxford. The Patriarch of the Church of Czechoslovakia will preach on Sunday, August 8th.

H. P. KINGDON,
Representative of the M.C.U. Council to the Conference of the I.A.R.F. at Arnhem in 1936.

M.C.U. CONSTITUTIONAL COMMITTEE.

SIR,

At the Annual General Meeting of the Union on May 27th, it was reported that the Council had appointed a Committee to consider the methods of management of the Union's affairs and the relation between its various activities, and to recommend any necessary amendments in the Constitution. The members present were invited to send in any suggestions or criticisms which they wished to make on these matters. This invitation is, of course, open to all members of the Union, and I shall be grateful if you will kindly allow me to call their attention to it.

As the Committee has already entered upon its task, any communications should be sent to me immediately.

T. J. WOOD.

520 Grand Buildings, Trafalgar Square, W.C.2.
June 3rd, 1937.